

ISLAM IN THE MALAY WORLD : AL-FALIMBAN'S SCHOLARSHIP

Mohammed Hussain Ahmad

ISLAM IN THE MALAY WORLD

AL-FALIMBAN'S SCHOLARSHIP

Mohammed Hussain Ahmad



IIUM
Press



IIUM
Press

ISLAM IN THE MALAY WORLD

Al-Falimbānī's Scholarship

ISLAM IN THE MALAY WORLD

Al-Falimbānī's Scholarship

Mohammed Hussain Ahmad



**IIUM
Press**

Gombak • 2017

First Print, 2017
©IIUM Press, IIUM

IIUM Press is a member of the Majlis Penerbitan Ilmiah Malaysia – MAPIM
(Malaysian Scholarly Publishing Council)

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise,
without any prior written permission of the publisher.

Perpustakaan Negara Malaysia

Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

Islam in the Malay World: Al-Falimbānī's Scholarship /

Mohammed Hussain Ahmad.

Includes index

Bibliography: page 307

ISBN 978-967-418-430-8

1. Falimbani, Abdus-Samad,--b. 1700.

2. Islam--History--Malay Archipelago. 3. Sufism--History.

4. Muslim scholars.

I. Mohammed Hussain Ahmad.

297.709598

Published by

IIUM Press

International Islamic University Malaysia

P.O. Box 10, 50728 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Tel: +603-6196 5014; Fax: +603-6196 4862/6298

Printed in Malaysia by



بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

*To My beloved late father, Pehin Penyurat Haji Awang Ahmad bin
Pehin Jawatan Dalam Haji Awang Mohammad Yusof (d.1436/2015),
May Allah sanctify his soul and bless him.*



Contents

| | | |
|------------|--|-------------|
| | <i>Transliteration</i> | <i>ix</i> |
| | <i>Preface</i> | <i>xi</i> |
| | <i>Acknowledgements</i> | <i>xiii</i> |
| | <i>Introduction</i> | <i>xv</i> |
| | <i>Abbreviations</i> | <i>lvii</i> |
| | <i>A Note on Technicality</i> | <i>lix</i> |
| Chapter 1: | Review of Sources and Contemporary Studies | 1 |
| Chapter 2: | Biographical Data of 'Abd aṣ-Ṣamad al-Falimbānī | 34 |
| Chapter 3: | Al-Falimbānī's Formation of a Scholarship | 74 |
| Chapter 4: | Al-Falimbānī's Schools | 178 |
| Chapter 5: | Al-Falimbānī's Writings: A Critical Assessment | 220 |
| | <i>Epilogue</i> | <i>281</i> |
| | <i>Appendix 1</i> | <i>287</i> |
| | <i>Appendix 2</i> | <i>296</i> |
| | <i>Appendix 3</i> | <i>300</i> |
| | <i>Bibliography</i> | <i>307</i> |
| | <i>Index</i> | <i>353</i> |

Chapter 5

Al-Falimbānī's Writings: A Critical Assessment

Introduction

The previous chapters have shown that al-Falimbānī travelled widely to various centres of Islamic learning and studied with and met many prominent Muslim scholars of his time. He acquired knowledge in every major Islamic discipline, which can be seen from the list of books he read with his teachers.¹ From this wide base of scholarship one would expect that his own writings would reflect his vast learning and experience. But when consulting the existing contemporary studies on al-Falimbānī's life and writings, we find them lacking. None of these contemporary studies have produced an accurate account of al-Falimbānī's writings.

Voorhoeve was the first to provide a biography of al-Falimbānī and enumerates within it five core works. These are respectively: *Zahrat al-Murīd*, *Hidāyat as-Sālikīn*, *Sayr as-Sālikīn*, *al-'Urwat al-Wuthqā* and *Naṣīhat al-Muslimīn*.² Later generations of scholars built on this foundation. The next major study on al-Falimbānī was done by El-Muhammady who follows Voorhoeve, listing one further treatise, *Rātib 'Abd aṣ-Ṣamad*.³ He included the *Rātib*, taken from Brockelmann's list of manuscripts. However, Brockelmann only lists two of al-Falimbānī's writings, the *Rātib* and *Naṣīhat al-Muslimīn*.⁴ Citing El-Muhammady, Drewes includes all of the above and was also the first to conclusively attribute *Tuhfat ar-Rāghibīn* to al-Falimbānī, building upon Voorhoeve's ascription.⁵ Quzwain added one further work to this growing list, which was *Zād al-Muttaqīn*.⁶

Using these eight texts as a base, further research has thus far uncovered a total of twelve texts attributed to al-Falimbānī. This brings the total number of his output to twenty, of which three have been wrongly

attributed, as we shall see below. Starting with the texts listed above I will highlight his scholarly contributions in various fields relating to the Malay socio-religious and intellectual milieu. I will also discuss a number of his writings that have not been identified or utilised previously which show that although he was committed to Ṣūfism and wrote extensively on the subject, he was also proficient in other disciplines including *fiqh* and *ḥadīth*. This will provide us with a more comprehensive view of al-Falimbānī's scholarly and intellectual significance.

Al-Falimbānī's Writings Listed by Contemporary Scholars

The first text mentioned above was his *Zahrāt al-Murīd fī Bayān Kalimat at-Tawḥīd* (The Flower for the Seeker on the Exposition of the Proclamation of the Oneness [of God]). Al-Falimbānī himself tells in this book that in the year 1178/1765, "a savant and a very learned scholar and the master of renowned authorship" (*al-ʿālim al-ʿallāmah ṣāhib at-taʿlīf al-mashhūr*) from Egypt, Aḥmad b. ʿAbd al-Munʿim ad-Damanhūrī, arrived in Mecca for his pilgrimage.⁷ Al-Falimbānī attended his series of lectures, taking his own notes and was asked afterwards by a fellow compatriot to translate this into Malay for the benefit of his close circle which he refers to as *baʿd al-muḥibbīn*.⁸ It is my contention that is one of his earliest writings, as it was completed in Mecca on Wednesday, 23 Dhū al-Ḥijjah 1178/12 June 1765.⁹ This work was completed when he was around forty-six years old. One would expect at this age that al-Falimbānī would have been in the prime of his writing career. Analysis of this work, however, leads me to conclude that this is his first output.

Textual analysis gives the impression that al-Falimbānī was concerned most probably about forgetting the contents of what was read as he states that "after the lectures, I took notes fearing forgetfulness" (*baʿd al-qirāʾah katabtu taqrīrahu khawf an-nisyān*).⁹ This perhaps shows his lack of experience in producing scholarly texts, because an established scholar would most likely not include such an admission. This is further highlighted due to the fact that he uses an honorific to designate his humility and incapacity in comparison to ad-Damanhūrī.

Compared to the lofty title given above, al-Falimbānī describes himself as “the worthless in need of God” (*al-ḥaqīr al-faqīr ilā Allāh*).¹⁰ If he was simply attempting to show humility, he would have used the latter title without the admission above. This further finds support in that this was the only place in his works where he included such an admission.

This text itself is based on his Arabic notes forming the *matn* with explanation in Malay. The main topic is the relationship between *manṭiq* (logic) and *uṣūl ad-dīn* (scholastic theology). In addition to this, he also delves into Arabic grammar (*naḥw*). Among the authoritative scholars and their writings listed in this tract are as-Sanūsī and his exposition on *Umm al-Barāhīn*, as-Suḥaymī and his commentary on *al-Hudhudī* (Muḥammad b. Maṣṣūr al-Hudhudī’s commentary on *Umm al-Barāhīn*), Ibn Ḥajar al-Haytamī and his *Tuḥfat [al-Muḥtāj]*, *al-Minhāj [al-Qawīm]* and *[al-I’lām bi-] Qawāṭir al-Islām*. He also mentions his teacher ‘Aṭā’ Allāh b. Aḥmad al-Azhārī al-Miṣrī al-Makkī and his book entitled *al-‘Iqd al-Farīd fī Taḥqīq Kalimat at-Tawḥīd*.

Although the *Zahrat al-Murīd* was mentioned by several contemporary scholars (except Brockelmann above), it is clear that they did not consult the text thoroughly, if at all. If they had consulted the text, they would see its value as a source in charting the religious disagreement in the Malay Archipelago at that time. Three main issues are discussed in the text; first, engaging in debates on advanced topics in front of the uneducated masses, for the sake of showing off and to be known as a scholar. The second issue relates to *takfīr* (accusation of unbelief), and the third and final topic is regarding those who have only basic knowledge but engage in debates on advanced issues.¹¹ In discussing these topics, al-Falimbānī calls them people from “the land below the wind” (*dibawah angin*), in other words, those ‘scholars’ from the Malay Archipelago with whom he disagrees with, in three distinct categories.

In giving advice to his novice students (*mubtadī*), he recommends that they do not engage in advanced discussion regarding the attributes and essence of God, as found in the affirmation and negation in the *shahādah* (there is no deity but Allāh). He contrasts this with the first deviated group, who, according to him are the ignorant people (*jāhil*) who teach this subject in depth in order to receive the status, prestige and material benefits of being known as an *‘ālim* (savant). This knowledge

is not required by the novice, as acquiring detailed knowledge of *'ilm at-tawhīd* is not an individual obligation (*farḍu 'ayn*) on everyone.¹²

The second group from the 'land below the wind' that al-Falimbānī mentions are those who accuse a believer of unbelief (*kufr*) without knowledge or certain evidence and without possessing detailed knowledge of their error. He comments that this is happening *en masse*, and highlights the danger of such action mentioning that whoever accuses another Muslim of unbelief without proof has it rebound upon himself. He supports his position by paraphrasing the widely known *ḥadīth* on the subject [*man kaffara mu'minan faqad kafar*]. He further supports his argument by citing the *kitāb ar-riddah* (book or chapter on apostasy) from Ibn Ḥajar's *Tuhfah* who is considered a major authority in the Shāfi'ī *madhhab*,¹³ stating that:

It is impermissible to call the children of a Muslim unbelievers, even if they do not pronounce the *shahādah* once in their life time or learn the twenty attributes (of God); even to the extent that they committed vice throughout their life. We cannot call such a person an unbeliever unless his action shows his *kufr*, or his statements reflect unbelief, or he directly affirms belief which is *kufr*.¹⁴

Furthermore, al-Falimbānī states that it is improper to make a judgment about someone's belief unless it is based on certainty or proven evidence, and that no one is capable of judging until learning the *'ilm ash-shara'* (Islamic law), *fiqh* (jurisprudence), and *tawhīd* (Divine Unity) from a credible and adept scholar.¹⁵

The third and last group that he mentions and criticises are those who discuss subjects for which they are not qualified. For instance, those who have recently completed studying *al-Ājurūmiyyah* and *Umm al-Barāhīn*, foundational texts in Arabic grammar and creed respectively, claiming themselves to be learned and capable of engaging in discussion of *'ilm uṣūl ad-dīn* (Principles of the Religion), to the extent that this leads to accusing others of *kufr*. This is improper even if proficient in *'ilm an-naḥw* (Arabic grammar), without mastering other Islamic sciences such as *'ilm al-mantiq* (logic) and other subjects.¹⁶

From this discussion, which takes about one quarter of the *Zahrat al-Murīd*, we can observe a number of important points. Firstly, he is

primarily addressing his close students but in illustrating his advice he refers to the volatile situation in the Malay Archipelago at that time. Secondly, this highlights that al-Falimbānī is acutely aware of the religious discontent in his homeland and feels the need to address these issues directly. Thirdly, this implies that he maintained contact with his homeland through both correspondence and students. Lastly, he knows that from among his students, a number would return home and engage these issues directly.

One further observation that can be made is that his methodology in advising his students shows his intellectual ability to relate specific issues to a wider, contemporary context. 'Abd ar-Raḥmān al-Ahdal reports regarding his teacher, al-Falimbānī, in his *an-Nafas al-Yamānī* that "he continued to emphasise to me the ethics of giving legal opinions (*fatwā*); that a *muftī* should not be confined merely to the question as this is insufficient. Rather, if he has knowledge of the current situation it must be perceived in his answer, as in this way, those engaged in this field know the religious benefits."¹⁷

Based on the evidence that numerous manuscript copies are available in several libraries,¹⁸ we can deduce that perhaps this work was once popular and widely circulated in the Archipelago, especially in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, but later its popularity declined as other new works were written and produced that supplanted it.

The second major work from the list (of al-Falimbānī's works) is *Hidāyat as-Sālikīn fī Sulūk Maslak al-Muttaqīn* (Guidance to Spiritual Seekers on following the manner of the Pious), which according to al-Falimbānī, was completed in Mecca, Tuesday, 5 Muharram 1192/3 February 1778. This treatise is a Malay translation and adaptation of al-Ghazālī's *Bidāyat al-Hidāyah* (*The Beginning of Guidance*), being perhaps second to *Sayr as-Sālikīn* in terms of popularity and prevalence among the list of al-Falimbānī's works. Several reprints and editions of this text can be found, in addition to *Hidāyat as-Sālikīn* being widely used as a textbook for students of Ṣūfīsm in *pesantren* (traditional Islamic religious learning centres) up to the present day.¹⁹

Though al-Falimbānī relies heavily on al-Ghazālī's *Bidāyat al-Hidāyah* of course – since this is essentially a translation, it is obvious from examining the text itself that he supplemented al-Ghazālī's original

text with his own additions taken from a variety of sources. In giving an indication of the scope of his work, al-Falimbānī mentions in his introduction (in both Arabic and Malay) that he wishes to translate into Malay the questions found in *Bidāyat al-Hidāyah*, with additions he deems beneficial to those who do not understand Arabic (*alḥabtu an utarjim masā'ilahu ma'a ziādat masā'il nafisah fī hādhā al-kitāb bi-kalām al-Jāwī li-yantaḥi man lā ma'rifat lahu bi-kalām al-'Arab*).²⁰

Deeper analysis of the text makes clear that al-Falimbānī based his supplements on his knowledge of numerous important Islamic works by renowned scholars of earlier generations, whom he listed in the *Hidāyat as-Sālikīn* itself. For instance, on the topic of ethics and Sūfism, he refers to several books, such as al-Ghazālī's *Minhāj al-'Ābidīn, Iḥyā' 'Ulūm ad-Dīn, Kitāb al-Arba'in fī Uṣūl ad-Dīn*, and *Mukhtaṣar al-Iḥyā'*, 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥaddād's *an-Naṣā'ih ad-Dīniyyah*, ash-Sha'rānī's *al-Yawāqūt wa 'l-Jawāhir, Madārij as-Sālikīn, 'Uhūd al-Muḥammadiyyah, 'Uhūd al-Mashāyikh*, and *Durar al-Jawāhir*, Ibn 'Abbād's *Sharḥ al-Ḥikam*, Ibn 'Aṭā' Allāh's *al-Ḥikam, at-Tanwīr fī Isqāṭ at-Tadbīr*, and *Miftāḥ al-Falāḥ*, as-Suhrawardī's *Awārif al-Ma'ārif*, al-Qushayrī's *ar-Risālah*, 'Abd al-Qādir al-'Aydārūs's *ad-Durr ath-Thamīn*, Aḥmad al-Qushāshī's *Bustān al-'Ārifīn*, 'Abd al-Qādir al-Fākihī's *al-Kifāyah fī Sharḥ Bidāyat al-Hidāyah*, 'Alī al-Marṣafī's *Manhaj as-Sālik ilā Ashraf al-Masālik* and Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī's *Qūt al-Qulūb*.²¹ In addition, al-Falimbānī on three occasions cited the opinion of his teacher as-Sammān from his *an-Nafahāt al-Ilāhiyyah fī Kayfiyyat Sulūk at-Ṭariqat al-Muḥammadiyyah*.²² On advising his students to use their time beneficially through the remembrance of God by diligent daily recitations of *awrād* (spiritual litanies), he recommends them to consult his own compilation of litanies entitled *al-'Urwat al-Wuthqā wa-Silsilat al-Walī al-Atqā*.²³

He also includes among his sources several Shāfi'ī *fiqh* and *ḥadīth* books such as, Ibn Ḥajar al-Haytamī's *al-Minhāj al-Qawīm*, Tāj ad-Dīn as-Subkī's *at-Tarshīḥ li-Bayān Ṣalāt at-Tasbīḥ*, Zakariyyā al-Anṣārī's *Sharḥ ar-Rawḍ*, al-Munāwī's commentary on as-Suyūṭī's *al-Jāmi' aṣ-Ṣaghīr* (entitled *Fayḍ al-Qādir Sharḥ al-Jāmi' aṣ-Ṣaghīr*), Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī's *Īqāz al-Qawābil li 't-Taḡarrub bi 'n-Nawāfil*, and his own *Jāwī* predecessor, 'Abd ar-Ra'ūf as-Sinkilī's *Umdat al-Muḥtājīn* (quoted twice).²⁴

It is also important at this point to highlight that al-Falimbānī pays special attention to the *fiqh* positions of the *Šūfīs*, often giving supporting examples of their rulings. For instance, on the question of the four *rak'ahs* supererogatory prayers before the obligatory *Zuhur* (midday) prayer, al-Falimbānī says that these are *sunnah mu'akkadah* (confirmed as *sunnah*) in the opinion of the *ahl at-taṣawwuf*.²⁵ He further relates that the two *rak'ahs* after the *Maghrib* (sunset) prayer are *sunnah mu'akkadah* according to the opinions of both the '*ulamā' aṣ-Šūfīyyah* and the *fuqahā'* (jurists).²⁶ Whilst discussing the four *rak'ahs* supererogatory prayers after the *Jum'ah* congregational prayer (on Fridays), al-Falimbānī explains that the *fuqahā'* and the *ahl at-taṣawwuf* differ in that two *rak'ahs* are *sunnah mu'akkadah* and two afterwards are *sunnah ghayr mu'akkadah* (optional) in the judgment of the former, whereas all four or even up to six *rak'ahs* are *sunnah mu'akkadah* in the ruling of the latter.²⁷

In addition, he points out the different opinions on *fiqh* questions according to the four Sunni *madhhabs*. For instance, although he adheres to the *Shāfi'ī madhhab*, on the usage of *az-zabād* (substance secreted by civet, used in perfumes), he says it is *makrūh* (disliked and discouraged) because it is *najis* (ritually impure) supporting his view with the opinion of the *Ḥanbalī* School of Islamic jurisprudence.²⁸ This, without doubt, shows his deep and wide perceptions in the field of *sharī'ah* law, in that he is able to broadly discuss the issue in question with ease. Perhaps this also indicates that he was broad-minded enough to consider the opinion of all four Sunni legal schools when he perceived one of them to be more acceptable to him regarding a particular issue. On one occasion in *Hidāyat as-Sālikīn*, he presents the opinion of the *muftī* of Medina in his time, his teacher Muḥammad b. Sulaymān al-Kurdī as an authoritative and reliable one (*qawl mu'tamad*) on the permissibility of accepting gifts from a ruler.²⁹

Upon analysing the contents of the *Hidāyat as-Sālikīn* further, it becomes clear that the text is not only a translation of al-Ghazālī's *Bidāyat al-Hidāyah*, but has numerous additions taken from other sources. For instance, the *Hidāyat as-Sālikīn* is composed of a preface, seven chapters and conclusion, whilst al-Ghazālī's text only includes three major chapters and a conclusion. Thus, subjects found in the *Hidāyah* such as the benefits of useful knowledge (*al-'ilm an-nāfi'*), the benefits of those who strive to

attain it, explicit explanations of the fundamentals of the Sunni creed, the 'way' (*kayfiyyah*) of acts of worship for various supererogatory prayers such as *al-ishrāq* (at sunrise), *al-istakhārah* (making a choice), *ad-ḍuḥā* (prayer at mid-morning), *at-tasbīḥ* (glorification), *al-ḥājah* (prayer for requesting a need), and numerous additions on the discussion of avoiding wrongdoing (*ijtināb al-ma'āṣī*), to name a few, are all inclusions from al-Falimbānī himself.³⁰

It is thus clear that al-Falimbānī was not merely translating the *Bidāyat al-Hidāyah* but more precisely, he was rendering and transforming the work of al-Ghazālī to suit and cater for the needs of his students and to provide a better understanding to his compatriots who have little or no knowledge of Arabic as indicated in his prologue. This is reflected further in his *Sayr as-Sālikīn* where he refers to *Bidāyat al-Hidāyah* four times and strongly recommends it to the *mubtadī* (novice) seeking the *ṭarīqah*. He adds that it comprises all the essential components of *uṣūl ad-dīn*, *fiqh*, *taṣawwuf* and *dhikr* as well as ethics (*akhlāq*).³¹

The popularity of the *Hidāyat as-Sālikīn* is further proven not just from its wide usage in contemporary times, but also from the numerous editions and reprints that it underwent during the early publication period in the nineteenth century. This perhaps shows its popularity and its constant demand among the Malay students and the wider audience public. Throughout my research, I have been able to locate copies of several published editions of this text. These include, the earliest printed copy dated Rabī' al-Ākhir 1298/March 1881 in which the proof-reader, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad Zayn al-Faṭānī (1856-1908), clearly indicates in the colophon that it was the first Malay text to be printed in Egypt by al-Maṭba'at al-Miṣriyyah, based on the handwritten copy of a certain Shaykh Ḥasan at-Tūkhī, who was perhaps an Egyptian calligrapher. Five years later, in 1303/1885, al-Maṭba'at al-Miriyyah in Mecca followed this by publishing their first edition of this work. On 25 Jumādā al-Ūlā 1311/4 December 1893, a copy written by Aḥmad b. Mulā Bahā' ad-Dīn, *khaṭīb* ad-Dābūl, possibly an Indian calligrapher, was printed in India in al-Maṭba'at al-Ḥasaniyyah, Bombay. In the same year, al-Maṭba'at al-Miriyyah, Mecca published another edition, perhaps its second, in Jumādā ath-Thāniyah 1311/December 1893. In Egypt, an edited copy by Ilyās Ya'qūb al-Azharī was published by Maṭba'at Dār Iḥyā' al-Kutub

al-‘Arabiyyah in Cairo on 15 Shawwāl 1342/20 May 1924.³² Thus, we can see that this epistle was printed frequently in several places. It has remained popular until today, as numerous editions, mostly transliterated from the *Jāwī* text to the Romanised characters are readily available in bookstores.

It is worth noting that manuscript copies of the *Hidāyat as-Sālikīn* are abundantly available in most libraries holding Malay manuscripts.³³ Consulting these manuscript copies, it is evident that this text gained popularity even during the lifetime of al-Falimbānī himself. From these, I found two copies dated 19 Jumādā al-Ākhirah 1225/22 July 1810 and 15 Dhū al-Ḥijjah 1236/13 September 1821, kept in the National Library of Malaysia and Leiden, respectively. Furthermore, the latter was transcribed in Buleleng, Bali, indicating that this text was already widely circulated in the Archipelago as early as the first quarter of the nineteenth century.³⁴

From the wide attention it received, one would expect that the *Hidāyat as-Sālikīn* would catch the notice of other scholars, especially among the *Jāwīs* since it was written in Malay. Apart from proofreading the Egyptian and Meccan publications of this text, the aforementioned Aḥmad al-Faṭānī also wrote an encomium (*taqrīz*) in a rhyming poem in Arabic which clearly indicates the value of the contribution of al-Falimbānī, not only in translating, but also in supplementing al-Ghazālī’s work by using additional source.³⁵

*Badā najmun fa-akhjala kulla najmin * wa-lu ‘lu ‘in fī ‘uyūni
‘n-nāẓirīnā*

A star emerged abashing all other stars, as pearls in the eyes of
observers

*Fa-ẓannu ash-shamsa tabzughu qultu lā, dhā * kitābu hidāyatīn li
‘s-sālikīnā*

They supposed the sun had risen, I said no, that is the book of
Guidance to Spiritual Seekers

*Kitābun lāḥa yahdī kulla qāfīn * sabīla al-awliyā ‘i al-muttaqīnā*
A book that gleamed, guiding all followers to the path of the pious
walīs

*Kitābun aḥsana at-ta ‘līfa fīhi * al-Falimbānī imāmu aṣ-ṣāliḥīnā*

A book excellently written by al-Falimbānī leader of the righteous

*Fa-naẓẓama fīhi min kutub al-Ghazālī * bi-mā qad kāna min durarin thamīnā*

He arranged in it from the books of al-Ghazālī of its priceless pearls

*Wa-ḍhamma ilayhi mim mā fī siwāhā * yawāqīta al-hudā li 'l-'āmilīnā*

Supplementing it from other sources, rubies of guidance for those who practice

Mutarjamatan bi-alsinati al-malāyū * fa-kāna bi-hā kitāban mustabīnā

Translated into the tongue of the Malay, making it a clearly accessible book

*Tajallā ba'da mā ṭala ikhtifāhu * bi-ḥusni aṭ-ṭab'ī yurḍī aṭ-ṭālibīnā*

Manifested after prolonged absenc with excellent printing gratifying students

*Bi-himmatī man samā faḍli ilāha * 'imādi al-fakhri najli al-akramīnā*

Determination of who exalted by grace of God, the prop of honour, the son of the noble

*Aqūlu mu'arrīkhan idh tamma ṭab'an * wa-an nithārahu fī 'l-'ālamīnā*

I date it on the completion of this edition, spreading in the world like confetti

*aḥḥibbāyā injalā fa-anāra bi 'ṭ-ṭab'ī * najmu hidāyatin li 's-sālikīna*

my beloved beget with printing illumine star of guidance for spiritual seekers

23 85 332 114 93 420 231³⁶

*wa-ṣalli wa-salliman Rabbī 'alā 'l-Muṣṭafā * wa 'l-āli wa 'rḥamnā āminā*

God's blessing and peace upon the Prophet and his house and God's mercy upon us, amen.

It is important to consult the works of al-Falimbānī's *Jāwī* contemporaries and later generations to trace the attention his scholarship received and to highlight its importance in Malay scholarly literature. It is to be remembered that one of al-Falimbānī's students, Nawawī al-Bantanī, completed his Arabic text entitled *Marāqī al-'Ubūdiyyah Sharḥ 'alā Bidāyat al-Hidāyah*, a commentary on al-Ghazālī's *Bidāyat al-Hidāyah* on 13 Dhū al-Qa'dah 1289/12 January 1873, almost one decade before the first printed edition of al-Falimbānī's *Hidāyat as-Sālikīn* appeared. Upon analysing the *Marāqī al-'Ubūdiyyah*, it is obvious that al-Bantanī also benefited from the *Hidāyat as-Sālikīn*, quoting it twice as part of his Arabic commentary despite the fact that al-Falimbānī's book was written in Malay. For instance, on commenting on a section from *Bidāyat al-Hidāyah*, "wa-lā tu'allim aḥadan min ahlik ... miqdār mālik, fainnahum in ra'awhu ...," al-Bantanī points out that the word *mālik* is read as *mā-laka* i.e. what you have in terms of status (*martabah*) as chosen by Shaykh Yūsuf as-Sinbillāwaynī. However, he says it can also be correctly read *mālik* (with a *kasrah*) i.e. your fortune or wealth, and this was the opinion of Shaykh 'Abd aṣ-Ṣamad [al-Falimbānī].³⁷ Thus, consulting such works provides us with an insight into the scholarly intellectual nexus and the transmission of knowledge from one generation of Malay scholars to another.

The third major text from the above list of al-Falimbānī's writings is *Sayr as-Sālikīn ilā 'Ibādat Rabb al-'Ālamīn* (Journey of the Spiritual Seekers towards Worshipping the Lord of the Universe), which is in four volumes and according to al-Falimbānī himself, was completed in four stages. He began writing the first volume in 1193/1779, which was completed in Mecca early 1194/1780, the second was completed in at-Ṭā'if on Saturday, 19 Ramaḍān 1195/8 September 1781, the third was completed in Mecca on Thursday, 19 Ṣafar 1197/23 January 1783, and the fourth and final volume was completed in at-Ṭā'if on Sunday, 20 Ramaḍān 1203/14 June 1789. Thus, the work took roughly ten years to complete.

Analysing these dates, it can be deduced that it took al-Falimbānī approximately two years to complete each of the first three volumes and a further six years before he was able to complete the final volume. However, based on my research, it is evident that he was busy with other

writing projects during the six years between completing the third and fourth volumes. I have discovered a new epistle which he was working on between completing his third and fourth volumes (1197-1203/1783-1789). At this point it is important to point out that this epistle has never been mentioned by modern researchers, clearly indicating that it has not been known to modern scholarship. As further discussion on this epistle will follow shortly, it suffices to say that al-Falimbānī was writing on Islamic Law (*sharī'ah*) after finishing his third volume, since he completed the epistle in question in 1201/1787.

Undoubtedly, the *Sayr as-Sālikīn* is the most popular text and the most widely circulated of all al-Falimbānī's works in the Malay Archipelago and it is upon this that his fame is chiefly based. It is also clear that this work is the largest among his works, and like al-Ghazālī's *Iḥyā'* on which it is primarily based, this was his magnum opus. In producing this text, al-Falimbānī followed a similar pattern as the *Hidāyat as-Sālikīn*, by supplementing al-Ghazālī's original work with his own additions taken from a variety of sources, which will be discussed shortly.

On giving an account on the scope of his work, al-Falimbānī mentions in his preface that God inspired him to translate into Malay the book of al-Ghazālī entitled *Lubāb Iḥyā' 'Ulūm ad-Dīn* (The Essentials of the Revival of the Sciences of Religion) which combines all the knowledge of *sharī'ah*, *uṣūl ad-dīn* and *taṣawwuf*, with [his own] precious additions deemed beneficial to those who have no knowledge of Arabic.³⁸ Though al-Falimbānī says that this text is a translation of al-Ghazālī's *Lubāb*, it is more accurate to describe it as an adaptation and rendition of it, as he includes his own expositions on al-Ghazālī's phrases to further clarify them, in addition to the substantial supplementary material taken from numerous other sources, including other works by al-Ghazālī himself.

It is important to consider the *Sayr as-Sālikīn* and al-Ghazālī's *Lubāb* together and give a brief outline of al-Falimbānī's objectives in producing this text. As indicated above, though al-Falimbānī clearly presents his work as a translation and adaptation of *Lubāb Iḥyā' 'Ulūm ad-Dīn*, the latter also known as *Mukhtaṣar Iḥyā' 'Ulūm ad-Dīn* (Abridgement of the Revival of the Sciences of Religion) and that he frequently mentions this name in his text, confusion still exists in modern studies which usually

assume that this work is a translation of al-Ghazālī's magnum opus *Iḥyā' 'Ulūm ad-Dīn* and not of the *Lubāb* or *Mukhtaṣar*. Upon further examination of the *Sayr as-Sālikīn*, it is evident that al-Falimbānī clearly distinguished between the two works of al-Ghazālī; he continuously differentiates between the *Mukhtaṣar* and the *Iḥyā'*.³⁹ This confusion is evidently due to the fact that the *Lubāb* or *Mukhtaṣar* of the *Iḥyā'* did not achieve the same fame as the *Iḥyā'* itself; most scholars have simply never been aware that al-Ghazālī himself composed an abridgement of his *Iḥyā'*. In fact, several biographers of al-Ghazālī, such as Ḥāji Khalīfah and al-Baghdādī, and modern scholars such as Ritter wrongly attributed this work to al-Ghazālī's younger brother Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Ghazālī (d. 520/1126). In this regard, Ritter relates that "he [Aḥmad] wrote an abridged version of the *Kitāb al-Iḥyā'* of his brother [i.e. Abū Ḥamid al-Ghazālī] which has not survived."⁴⁰

I was able to locate and consult one of the earliest copies of this *Mukhtaṣar Iḥyā'* in the Library of the University of Leiden.⁴¹ This copy has printed in the margins of al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī's *Nuḥḍat an-Nāẓirīn fī Tafsīr Āyāt min Kitāb Rabb al-'Ālamīn*, as published by Dār al-Kutub al-'Arabīyyah in Egypt in 1328/1910.⁴² It clearly shows in the prologue that al-Ghazālī himself abridged his own magnum opus *Iḥyā'* due to what he describes as the impracticability of carrying his voluminous work during travel. In his preface, al-Ghazālī says "it occurred to me during some of my travels to extract from *Iḥyā' 'Ulūm ad-Dīn* its pith due to the impracticability of carrying it along because of its enormous size. I embark on the task asking God to grant me success and supplicate Him for the best ..." (*qad 'anna lī fī ha'ḍ asfārī an astakhrij min Iḥyā' 'Ulūm ad-Dīn lubābahu li-ta'adhdhur istiṣḥābihi ma'a kibar ḥajmihi, fa-aqdamtu 'alā dhālik, mustawfiqan min Allāh wa-mustakhīran lahu* ...).⁴³ Thus, it is clear that al-Falimbānī primarily based his translation on the *Mukhtaṣar* (abridgement) of the *Iḥyā'* and not the original multi-volume *Iḥyā'*.

However, in terms of the arrangement of his text, al-Falimbānī follows al-Ghazālī's *Iḥyā'* by dividing his work into four *arbā'* (quarters). The first comprises acts of worship (*al-'ibādāt*) dealing with creed, ritual purity, worship (*ṣalāt*), other types of prayer and devotion, almsgiving, fasting, and the pilgrimage; the second quarter deals with habitual acts

or norms of daily behaviour (*al-'ādāt*) constituting books on proper conduct regarding eating habits, marriage, acquiring goods, travelling, and the like; the third quarter discusses mortal vices (*al-muhlikāt*) about destructive wrongdoings, and, after two general books (i.e. chapters) on the mysteries of the heart and how to control and educate it, the book gives counsel with regard to the various vices discussed previously. The fourth quarter, on the ways to salvation (*al-munjiyāt*) deals with the various stages, states and aspects of the mystical life, such as penitence, patience, gratitude, renunciation, trust in God, and love of Him. However, unlike al-Falimbānī's *Sayr as-Sālikīn*, although the arrangement in the *Mukhtaṣar* followed that of the *Iḥyā'*, al-Ghazālī's abridgment did not follow the division into the four *arbā'* but only lists the contents according to chapters.

Closer analysis of the text further reveals that al-Falimbānī supplemented his work with substantial additions taken from numerous important Islamic works by renowned scholars of previous generations. He mentioned these sources in various places throughout his *Sayr as-Sālikīn* but specifically in the third volume, when he recommends his students to consult his list of *Ṣūfī* writings suitable for the three levels of competence, presenting them to match their abilities. According to al-Falimbānī, these works should be read by the *sālikīn* (travellers on the mystical path) progressively, from the most basic texts for the *mubtadī* (the novice), to more difficult for the *mutawassiṭ* (the intermediate), and finally to the most difficult and complex for the *muntahī* (the adept).⁴⁴ At this point, it is important to remember that evidently, al-Falimbānī was already teaching his students when he wrote his presumed first book, *Zahr al-Murīd*, in 1178/1765. However, the importance of his list⁴⁵ is that it indicates that by that time he composed the list he had reached the summit of his teaching career. He did not only list these numerous *Ṣūfī* writings, but evidently had read all of them as he was able to arrange them according to the different levels and aptitudes of his students. In addition, as we shall see shortly, al-Falimbānī was very familiar with these works and had deep and profound knowledge and experience of *taṣawwuf* in that he was able to provide commentary and opinions on all of these works.

To gain better insight into the additional materials he utilised, it is appropriate at this stage to give an outline of them. The number of *Ṣūfī* writings that al-Falimbānī lists as suitable for the varied abilities of his students comprises a total of one hundred and ten books, to be precise.⁴⁶ For the *muḥtadī*, he listed fifty-five titles, including five works by al-Ghazālī, nine works by ash-Sha'rānī, three works by 'Abd al-Qādir al-'Aydārūs, two works by Tāj ad-Dīn an-Naqshabandī al-Hindī and Ṣiddīq Khān al-Madanī respectively, five works by 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥaddād, six works each of Muṣṭafā al-Bakrī and as-Sammān, one work each of Abū aṭ-Ṭalīb al-Makkī, al-Qushayrī, 'Abd al-Qādir al-Jīlānī, as-Suhrawardī, Qāsim al-Khānī, Zakariyyā al-Anṣārī, al-Qushāshī, al-Kūrānī, and 'Abd Allāh al-Mīrghānī, plus several works by other less prominent scholars. Al-Falimbānī also includes one work by his compatriot, as-Sinkilī's *Umdat al-Muḥtājīn* and recommends three of his own works, *Hidāyat as-Sālikīn*, *Sayr as-Sālikīn* and *al-'Urwat al-Wuthqā* as suitable for this novice level. Most of these works are primary texts comprising all the essential components of *uṣūl ad-dīn*, *fiqh*, *taṣawwuf*, *dhikr* as well as *akhlāq*, stressing the conformity of *ṭarīqah* with *sharī'ah* and the strict adherence to the latter before the *sālik* can achieve spiritual progress along his mystical journey.⁴⁷

As for the *mutawassīṭ*, al-Falimbānī lists thirty-one titles, including three works by Ibn 'Aṭā' Allāh, particularly his *al-Ḥikam* and its commentaries by Ibn 'Abbād, Aḥmad al-Marzūqī, Ibn 'Allān an-Naqshabandī and al-Qushāshī, the latter, according to al-Falimbānī was the most complex and profound commentary on *al-Ḥikam*.⁴⁸ He then lists a work by Raslān ad-Dimashqī wrongly titled as *al-Ḥikam*. However, from the title of its commentary, *Faṭḥ ar-Raḥmān* by Zakariyyā al-Anṣārī listed next, it is clear that this was Raslān ad-Dimashqī's *Risālah fī 'l-Tawḥīd*. On describing the *Faṭḥ ar-Raḥmān*, al-Falimbānī relates that this was the first text that he read with as-Sammān when he started his studies with him.⁴⁹

Moreover, he mentions a commentary by 'Abd al-Ghanī an-Nābulusī on the work of Raslān. Though he does not provide any title for this commentary, it is clear that an-Nābulusī wrote a commentary on Raslān's *Risālah* entitled *Khamrat al-Ḥān wa-Rannat al-Alhān*. There is an error in Raslān's book title in al-Falimbānī's list, perhaps by the

scribe. It is worth pointing out another error, probably by the scribe, here an-Nābulusī was described as the teacher of as-Sammān (*Shaykh 'Abd al-Ghanī an-Nābulusī guru shaykh kita Sīdī Muḥammad as-Sammān*).⁵⁰ However, as far as I know, as-Sammān had never studied directly with an-Nābulusī; in fact, he was his grand-pupil through Muṣṭafā al-Bakrī. When an-Nābulusī died in 1731, as-Sammān was only thirteen years old. This is further supported by a note in the *Sayr as-Sālikīn* itself, which clearly reveals that as-Sammān did not study with an-Nābulusī as he was mentioned as a student of al-Bakrī, who in turn was a disciple of an-Nābulusī. In this regard, al-Falimbānī relates "... *Shaykh 'Abd al-Ghanī an-Nābulusī, yaitu guru Sīdī Shaykh Muṣṭafā al-Bakrī, yaitu guru shaykh kita Sīdī Shaykh as-Sammān*" [... an-Nābulusī, a teacher of al-Bakrī, who was a teacher of as-Sammān].⁵¹ Al-Falimbānī then completes his list by including several theological works such as an-Nābulusī's *Miftāḥ al-Ma'īyyah fī 'l-Ṭarīqat an-Naqshabandiyyah*, ash-Sha'rānī's *al-Jawāhir wa 'l-Yawāqīt*, Muḥammad Ghawth's *al-Jawāhir al-Khams*, and several other works of al-Jilānī, al-Bakrī, as-Sammān and Ṣiddīq al-Madanī.

The final and highest stage that the spiritual mystical traveller can attain is the level of the *muntahī*, where they are exposed to the most complex works on *taṣawwuf*, which are to an extent, controversial to non-*Ṣūfīs*. On top of the list for this level, consisting of twenty-four titles, are the works of Ibn al-'Arabī, which include his *al-Futūḥāt al-Makkiyyah*, *Mawāqī' an-Nujūm* and *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam*, with commentaries on the latter by Munlā 'Abd ar-Raḥmān al-Jāmī, an-Nābulusī and 'Alī al-Mahāyīmī (or al-Mahā'imī), al-Jilī's *al-Insān al-Kāmil*, al-Ghazālī's *as-Sirr al-Maḍnūn bi-hi 'alā Ghayr Ahlih*,⁵² *Mishkāt al-Anwār*,⁵³ *al-Maqṣad al-Asnā fī Ma'nā Asmā' Allāh al-Ḥusnā*⁵⁴ and several chapters on 'ilm al-ḥaqīqah in his *Iḥyā' 'Ulūm ad-Dīn*, such as *kitāb aṣ-ṣabr*, *kitāb ash-shukr*, *kitāb al-maḥabbah*, *kitāb at-tawḥīd* and the beginning of *kitāb at-tawakkul* (all these are actually main chapters in the *Iḥyā'*), al-Burhānpūrī's *at-Tuḥfat al-Mursalah* and its commentaries, including al-Kūrānī's *Iḥāf adh-Dhakī* and an-Nābulusī's *Nukhbat al-Mas'alah Sharḥ at-Tuḥfat al-Mursalah*⁵⁵ and his *Idāḥ al-Maqṣūd min Ma'nā Waḥdat al-Wujūd*, ash-Sha'rānī's *Lawāqīḥ al-Anwār* and *Kashf al-Ḥijāb*, ash-Shinnāwī's *Mir'āt al-Ḥaqā'iq* and its commentary, 'Alī al-Mahāyīmī's *Irādat ad-Daqā'iq*, and al-Kūrānī's *al-Maslak al-Mukhtār fī Ma'rifat aṣ-*

Ṣādir al-Awwal wa-Aḥdāth al-‘Ālam bi ‘l-Ikhtiyār. Finally, al-Falimbānī includes three works of his *Jāwī* predecessors, as-Sumatrānī’s *Jawhar al-Ḥaqā’iq* and *Tanbīh at-Tullāb fī Ma‘rifat al-Malik al-Wahhāb*, and as-Sinkīlī’s *Ta’yīd al-Bayān Ḥāshiyat Idāḥ al-Bayān fī Taḥqīq Masā’il al-A’yān*, and concluding the list with his own work, *Zād al-Muttaqīn fī Tawḥīd Rabb al-‘Ālamīn*.

It is important to remark that from the above lists, it is evident that al-Falimbānī himself had attained the highest level of the *sālikīn*; firstly, because he was allowed to read such advanced works with his teachers; secondly, fully grasping their contents, he was able to categorise them and recommend them further to other *muntahī*; and thirdly and most significantly, he was competent in teaching these works to his students and in composing a work in the most advanced category; and finally, he was able to give his opinion regarding which among these works are more complicated or superior than the others. This is evident, for instance from his comments on the commentaries of al-Burhānpūrī’s *at-Tuḥfat* when he relates “... *at-Tuḥfat al-Mursalāh* by al-Burhānpūrī and its commentaries by al-Kūrānī, and *Nukḥbat al-Mas’alah Sharḥ at-Tuḥfat al-Mursalāh* by an-Nābulusī ... and several other commentaries which I read. However, the commentary by an-Nābulusī was the best out of all the commentaries I had seen.”⁵⁶

Thus, with supplementary material excerpted from these writings, one can expect that his *Sayr as-Sālikīn* was far from being merely a translation of al-Ghazālī’s work. Moreover, it should be noted that these were not the only books al-Falimbānī utilised for his comments as he clearly mentioned, for instance on questions relating to *fiqh*, he alludes to a number of *fiqh* books which he consulted and quoted but without naming them.⁵⁷ In addition to the above list of *taṣawwuf* books recommended for the *muḥtadī*, he points out there are yet several other books suitable for this stage but does not name them, explaining that the list he provided (fifty-five titles) is more than sufficient for them.⁵⁸

A particularly important point that we can deduce from analysing this list, is that al-Falimbānī was fully aware that his works, including his *Sayr as-Sālikīn* would eventually be accessible not only to his students in Mecca but also to his compatriots back in the Malay Archipelago. Realising this, he took the opportunity to list almost all major books

of *taṣawwuf* (one hundred and ten titles) arranging them into three levels suitable for the varied abilities of his students, and at the same time, indirectly telling the *Jāwī* learners which of these works were to be read and which were to be reserved only for the elite, as they were to be studied sequentially. This hypothesis perhaps finds its support by looking back at the earlier three distinct categories of people from the Malay Archipelago with whom al-Falimbānī disagrees in his *Zahrat al-Murīd*. Thus, by understanding and being fully aware of the relevant books appropriate for both reading and teaching according to the three levels of competency, the Muslim public would be guided in their daily religious life and guarded from deviant teachings of the ignorant. Further evidence can be extracted from the *Sayr as-Sālikīn* itself as al-Falimbānī advise and warn saying "however, the *taṣawwuf* teachings included in the discussion of the *ʿilm al-ḥaqīqah* from the books for the third level [the *muntahī*] are of no benefit to others, save the *muntahī*; conversely, the *mubtadī* who had not fully comprehend the *sharīʿah* and the aspect of *ṭarīqah*, might be led astray or even to heresy by such works."⁵⁹ This is perhaps the most logical reason why al-Falimbānī included three works from his *Jāwī* predecessors among the books for the *muntahī*, indicating that they should not be read save by the adepts.

Without properly consulting the *Sayr as-Sālikīn* and fully understanding the nature of al-Falimbānī's works, this has often led modern scholars to accuse him of smuggling ideas and teachings alien to al-Ghazālī into his work. Among such scholars, is our contemporary Abdul Fatah Haron, who claims that al-Falimbānī's *Sayr as-Sālikīn* is confusing as it does not accord with the content of al-Ghazālī's *Iḥyāʾ*, with numerous additions from unnamed sources unavailable in the latter.⁶⁰ The Dutch scholar, Martin van Bruinessen also maintains that al-Falimbānī successfully smuggled into his Malay adaptations of al-Ghazālī's works some of the rejected doctrines, especially in his *Sayr as-Sālikīn*, such as elements of *wahdat al-wujūd* taken from other sources, which seemed, according to van Bruinessen, quite alien to al-Ghazālī's Sunni mysticism.⁶¹ However, this was not the case, as shown above; al-Falimbānī himself clearly points out that aside from translating the works of al-Ghazālī, he did not 'smuggle,' but supplemented his work with invaluable additions that he deemed beneficial, particularly to those

who have little or no command of Arabic, and furthermore that these additional sources were clearly enumerated in his text.

An example of such additions which al-Falimbānī deemed beneficial was the discussion on *maqāmāt an-nafs as-sab'ah* or 'the seven stages of the soul' which is portrayed as a journey of the soul within oneself to the Absolute and to the attainment of perfection.⁶² As well as the *Ṣūfī* doctrine of *martabat tujuh* or *al-marātib as-sab'ah* (the seven grades of being).⁶³ Deeper analysis of the text makes it clear that al-Falimbānī based his discussion on his knowledge of numerous important *Ṣūfī* literatures such as Qāsim al-Khānī's *as-Sayr wa 's-Sulūk* further expanding al-Ghazālī's existing three stages into *maqāmāt an-nafs as-sab'ah*,⁶⁴ and quotes as authoritative sources al-Burhānpūrī's *at-Tuhfat al-Mursalah*, and works by Muṣṭafā al-Bakrī, and as-Sammān for his discussion on *martabat tujuh*.⁶⁵ In fact, al-Ghazālī himself alludes to this issue in his discussion of the four levels of *tawḥīd* in his book (or chapter) on *tawakkul*. However, he purposely does not elaborate profoundly as he says that it is impossible to reveal such secrets, further quoting a *Ṣūfī* phrase "revealing the Divine secret is unbelief" (*ifshā' sirr ar-rubūbiyyah kufr*).⁶⁶

Such confusion is again evident to those who do not comprehend or might be worried about the intended mystical meaning of *Ṣūfī* terminology. For instance, Haron was clearly confused in that he interpolates the popular *Ṣūfī* teaching of *martabat tujuh* with the *Ṣūfī* doctrine of *waḥdat al-wujūd*, and further accuses such dogma of deviation from the proper teaching of the *sharī'ah*. He adds, though the doctrine of *waḥdat al-wujūd* was championed by scholars such as Hamzah al-Fanṣūrī, Shams ad-Dīn as-Sumāṭrānī, Nūr ad-Dīn ar-Rānīrī, Muḥammad b. Faḍl Allāh al-Burhānpūrī, 'Abd aṣ-Ṣamad al-Falimbānī, Dāwūd al-Faṭānī, Muḥammad Nafīs al-Banjārī, and others, he believes that such teaching resembles the teaching of the esoterics (*al-Bāṭiniyyah*). To further support his arguments, Haron quotes as an authoritative source, Aḥmad al-Khaṭīb al-Minkābāwī's (d. 1334/1916) *ash-Shumūs al-Lāmi'ah fī Radd Bida' Ahl 'I-Marātib as-Sab'ah*.⁶⁷

However, on consulting this work, it is clear that al-Minkābāwī himself did not oppose the teaching of *martabat tujuh*. He relates, "I, a destitute and weak person Aḥmad Khaṭīb al-Minkābāwī ... the Imām and Khaṭīb (orator) of the Shāfi'ī shrine (*al-Maqām ash-Shāfi'ī*), who lectures

at al-Masjid al-Ḥarām says, in 1328/1910 a question posed and sent from the Archipelago regarding a short epistle attributed to al-Ghazālī on the question of *martabat tujuh*, requesting clarification whether it was his work or not, and whether the contents were sound or not, as the masses of the *Jāwīs* had strayed in believing that this was the esoteric knowledge or *'ilm al-bāṭin* according to the perception of *sharī'ah* and further believing that whoever did not study this text is prone to die in *kufṛ*, a reason that leads the ignorant to diligently learn this work. Upon my perusal, I found the contents were lies, none were teachings of al-Ghazālī or the scholars of Islam, and generally it contains blasphemy to words of God and His Prophet which leads to the hell fire.⁶⁸ Such teaching, according to al-Minkābāwī, was adopted from the *Ṣūfī* doctrine of *waḥdat al-wujūd* by the ignorant who do not even understand the teaching at all, and do not grasp the meaning of the terminologies understood only by the adepts.⁶⁹ Thus, al-Minkābāwī did not reject the *Ṣūfī* teachings of *martabat tujuh*, however, he stresses that such texts contains terminologies which can only be comprehended by those who had attained the specific stages, and reminds the masses that such knowledge is only apprehended by those who comply with and fully adhere to the *sharī'ah*.⁷⁰

It is important to recall al-Ghazālī's own opinion on the *Ṣūfīs* so that we are aware of and able to compare the perception that al-Falimbānī had of them. In describing the ways of *taṣawwuf*, al-Ghazālī says "I knew that the complete mystic 'way' includes both intellectual belief and practical activity; the latter consists in getting rid of the obstacles in the self and in stripping off its base characteristics and vicious morals, so that the heart may attain to freedom from what is not God and to constant recollection of Him."⁷¹

According to al-Ghazālī, though he advanced to the highest possible comprehension of the intellectual side of *Ṣūfīsm* by acquainting himself through reading books such as Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī's *Qūt al-Qulūb*, the works of al-Ḥārith al-Muḥāsibī, the various narratives about al-Junayd, ash-Shiblī and Abū Yazīd al-Bisṭāmī, and other discourses of their leading men, plus by oral instruction in the knowledge of *taṣawwuf*, he confessed that what is most distinctive of *taṣawwuf* is something which cannot be apprehended by study, but rather only by *dhawq* (immediate experience), by ecstasy and by a moral change.⁷² On realising this, al-Ghazālī without

hesitation shows his advocacy by pointing out that the *Ṣūfīs* were men who had real experiences, not men of words, and that he had progressed to the furthest possible stage by way of intellectual apprehension. What remained was not to be attained by oral instruction and study, but only by *dhawq* and by walking in the *Ṣūfīs* way.⁷³

Al-Ghazālī's own words clearly reveal that although he does not proclaim the *Ṣūfī* doctrine of *waḥdat al-wujūd* directly, he indicates that he supports and believes in it. In his *Iḥyā'*, on the discussion of different *awrād* according to different circumstances, he says, "let it be known that the novice disciple (*al-murīd*) who cultivates for the Hereafter, the traveller on its path, can only be in one of these six states: he is either a worshipper, or a savant, or a learner, or a leader, or a practitioner, or a *muwaḥḥid* (adherent of the absolute Oneness) absorbed in the One and only Eternal God ... the sixth: the *muwaḥḥid* absorbed in the One and only Eternal God whose concerns have become a single concern, he does not love save God, does not fear except God, does not anticipate livelihood from other than God, does not see anything but sees God Most High in it. Those who attained this high stage, do not need a variety or range of *awrād*, rather his special *wird* after his five daily prayers (*al-maktūbāt*), is a single formula, which is the continuous presence of his heart with God in every state all the time."⁷⁴

This comes quite close to elements of *waḥdat al-wujūd*. Thus, to understand al-Falimbānī and his teachings better, we should place him in this context, fully aware that he must have attained these stages, which are only known to and experienced by the *Ṣūfīs* not only by way of intellectual apprehension but also through spiritual experience (*dhawq*).

To highlight further al-Falimbānī's contributions to the Malay intellectual life, we next turn to the history of the Archipelago. Before the eighteenth century, al-Ghazālī was known to some extent to the Malay Archipelago through citations of his works occasionally in the writings of al-Falimbānī's predecessors. However, it was not until the eighteenth century that al-Ghazālī was widely introduced to the Malay audience when al-Falimbānī became the first *Jāwī* scholar to fully translate two of his works, *Bidāyat al-Hidāyah* and *Lubāb* or *Mukhtaṣar Iḥyā' 'Ulūm ad-Dīn*. With these translations, not only did al-Falimbānī place al-Ghazālī and his works in the highest stature for Malay *Ṣūfism*, but he

also indirectly made such works readily available to the masses in the Archipelago. In fact, through his *Hidāyat as-Sālikīn* and *Sayr as-Sālikīn*, al-Falimbānī further illustrates to the ignorant and those who had been led astray, the orthodox *Ṣūfī* teachings of al-Ghazālī which harmonise and are in accord with the sound teachings of those profound *Ṣūfī* masters often accused of unorthodoxy such as Ibn al-ʿArabī, al-Jīlī, al-Hallāj, al-Jīlānī, al-Junayd al-Baghdādī, and his *Jāwī* predecessors such as as-Sumatrānī and as-Sinkīlī. At the same time, he introduces the moderate approach of al-Ghazālī whose ethics preponderates over the occult elements of *taṣawwuf* and further stresses the importance of compliance with the *sharīʿah* law and conformity with religious observances; in this way al-Falimbānī strives to pull the masses back into the mainstream of sound *taṣawwuf* teachings.

Thus, it is clear that his translating al-Ghazālī's works, let alone his own rendering and additions, is more than enough evidence to highlight one of al-Falimbānī major contributions to the intellectual spiritual development of the *Jāwīs*, moulding the socio-religious life in the Malay Archipelago. Moreover, the numerous additions to his translations indirectly bring the rich Islamic scholarly works to the Malay world, which were previously not easily accessible or even unknown to them. Hence, al-Falimbānī's works, especially the *Sayr as-Sālikīn* and *Hidāyat as-Sālikīn*, should be credited as the causal agents that brought the influence of al-Ghazālī into the Malay world particularly through his *Iḥyāʾ* and his other works.

On consulting the writings of al-Falimbānī's *Jāwī* contemporaries and later generations, it is evident that his pioneering effort in introducing the works of al-Ghazālī to the Malay Archipelago was then followed by later scholars. For instance, Dāwūd al-Faṭānī accomplished his own Malay translation of al-Ghazālī's *Minhāj al-ʿĀbidīn* entitled *Minhāj al-ʿĀbidīn ilā Jannat Rabb al-ʿĀlamīn* on Friday, 15 Jumādā al-Ākhirah 1240/4 February 1825, almost four decades after al-Falimbānī completed his rendering of al-Ghazālī's *Lubāb al-Iḥyāʾ*.⁷⁵

Since the *Sayr as-Sālikīn* was al-Falimbānī's magnum opus, one can expect that its popularity and circulation is wider than any of his other works. Evidently, this text was his most popular and enjoyed the most prevalence among his works. Up to the present time, numerous

manuscript copies are preserved in different libraries holding Malay collections, in addition, several publications and modern editions rendered into Romanised text are readily available in bookstores. Furthermore, the *Sayr as-Sālikīn* is still widely used as a textbook in *pesantren* in Malaysia and Indonesia to the present day.⁷⁶ The earliest edition that I was able to locate was printed in 1306/1888 by Maḥmūd al-Labānī al-Makkī, a lithographic print from a hand written copy by Shaykh Aḥmad b. Yūsuf al-Ashī in 1294/1877, who resided in *Dā'irat Qushāshiyah* (Qushāshi Circle) in Mecca. This was then followed by the first edition published in Būlāq, Egypt by al-Maṭba'at al-Amīriyyah in 1309/1891.⁷⁷ In addition, Drewes mentioned another edition printed in Cairo in 1372/1952.⁷⁸ More recent editions were published in Indonesia, Singapore, Thailand and Malaysia which are still widely circulated and readily available in bookstores. This proves that it has not fallen into disuse. Moreover, this text is now widely published in its Romanised edition to penetrate a larger audience, particularly those who cannot read the original *Jāwī* text. It is worth noting that among the manuscript copies that I have sighted, there is a copy written in Mecca dated 4 Rabī' al-Awwal 1211/6 September 1796.⁷⁹ Looking at the date, this copy was made within less than eight years after al-Falimbānī completed his final volume (in Ramaḍān 1203/June 1789). Further, this copy was written during the lifetime of al-Falimbānī and perhaps the scribe himself was one of his students, though further research needs to be done.

The fourth text from al-Falimbānī's list of writings is *al-'Urwat al-Wuthqā wa-Silsilat al-Walī al-Atqā* (The Firmest Bond and the Genealogical Spiritual Chain of the Most Pious Saint). Though this text is undated, al-Falimbānī himself cited it twice in his *Hidāyat as-Sālikīn* and once in his *Sayr as-Sālikīn*.⁸⁰ From this, we can deduce that it must have been written before 1192/1778, the year he completed the *Hidāyat as-Sālikīn*.

This text share one characteristic with a small number of al-Falimbānī's other writings in that there is no date or place of completion. A number of questions are raised regarding this especially when looking at al-Falimbānī's meticulous practice of dating and citing of sources. All of the undated texts except one are collections of litanies and supplications, which internal evidence suggests he received directly from as-Sammān

himself. We know from his earliest writing, *Zahrat al-Murīd* that his practice was to date his work from the beginning of his writing career. We also know that he continued to date his writings after meeting as-Sammān. In short, his later writings are dated and all mention as-Sammān. Why didn't he date *'Urwat al-Wuthqā* and his other writings?

The first clue is that in his *Sayr as-Sālikīn*, al-Falimbānī describes the collection of litanies as being received directly from the teachings of as-Sammān. The second clue is from *'Urwat al-Wuthqā* itself when he mentions in the introduction that he received this compilation from as-Sammān in the context of making the pledge of allegiance (*bay'ah*) to his teacher and by direct oral transmission (*talqīn*).⁸¹ The third clue is that this compilation and the other undated writings are not intellectual in nature; they are simply collections of litanies and supplications for use in daily practise. For someone who had begun to establish himself as a scholar, such a person would not circulate and publish a simple collection of *awrād* meant for his personal use. Thus, I theorise that he must have written it in Medina during his period of study with as-Sammān, 1181-86/1766-72, most likely for his personal use when he was advancing in his spiritual journey. Perhaps, this is evident in the *silsilah* of the previously mentioned manuscript copy of this text which shows that his student, Maḥmūd [b. Kinān al-Falimbānī] handed it down further to his student, Sulaymān of Lambirah, Aceh,⁸² obviously written by al-Falimbānī's grand-pupil.

At this point, it suffices to say that the *al-'Urwat al-Wuthqā* consists of *kayfiyyat talqīn* and *bay'ah*, *awrād* of as-Sammān to be recited after *'ishā'* and *subḥ*, *ḥizb an-Nawawī*, the acclaimed compilations of *du'ā'* and litanies by Imām an-Nawawī, the *ḥizb al-baḥr* by ash-Shādhilī, *wird as-saḥar* (midnight litany) by Muṣṭafā al-Bakrī, and finally a *mubhijah* (delightful litany) attributed to as-Sammān.⁸³ It is also evident from this text that al-Falimbānī inclines towards *taṣawwuf* as he gives emphasis to the *fiqh* positions of the *Ṣūfīs*. For instance, on the question of the *tahajjud* prayer (the late-night supererogatory prayer), al-Falimbānī says it is *sunnah mu'akkadah* in the opinion of the Shāfi'ī *madhhab*, conversely, it is *wājib* (obligatory) to the *Ṣūfīs* (*ahl aṭ-ṭarīqah*).⁸⁴

It is worth mentioning that in the *al-'Urwat al-Wuthqā*, al-Falimbānī provides his *silsilah* for the Khalwatiyyah Sammāniyyah Order, showing

his spiritual pedigree started with as-Sammān, followed by al-Bakrī, then back to numerous *Ṣūfī* Masters such as Mamshād ad-Dīnawārī, al-Junayd al-Baghdādī, as-Sarī as-Saqāṭī, Ma'rūf al-Karkhī, Dāwūd at-Ṭā'ī, and al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, and back to 'Alī, to the Prophet SAW, to Jibrīl (Gabriel) and to God, the Most Exalted; counting thirty-six intermediaries between al-Falimbānī and the Prophet SAW himself. However, by comparing this *silsilah* with those recorded in *Sayr as-Sālikīn*, as-Sammān's and al-Ḥifnī's *silsilah*, which should accord as both received the same Order from the same al-Bakrī, I found at least three names were missing in al-Falimbānī's *silsilah*, which can be corrected by comparing all these sources.⁸⁵ It is to be remembered that in terms of *ḥadīth* narrations, this chain of Khalwatiyyah *silsilah*, according to al-Fādānī is not reliable as it was strongly criticised by leading *muḥaddiths* such as adh-Dhahabī, al-Mizzī, Ibn aṣ-Ṣalāḥ, al-'Alā'ī and Ibn Kathīr.⁸⁶

According to al-Falimbānī, *al-'Urwat al-Wuthqā* was written in Arabic.⁸⁷ However, none of the existing manuscript copies known thus far are in Arabic; all are written in *Jāwī*. Further description of the Arabic *al-'Urwat al-Wuthqā* by al-Falimbānī indicates that it contained *ḥadīth* on the merits of *dhikr* and the call to increase it,⁸⁸ which completely differs from the aforementioned contents. Thus, perhaps it must have been another work carrying a similar title or an addendum to the existing text.

The fifth text from al-Falimbānī's above listed writings is *Rātib [ash-]Shaykh 'Abd aṣ-Ṣamad al-Falimbānī* (Regular Invocations of Shaykh 'Abd aṣ-Ṣamad al-Falimbānī). This text is the second undated writing of al-Falimbānī. The only manuscript copy available thus far is evidently copied after his death as it includes *kaifiyyat ziyārat* as-Sammān and 'Abd aṣ-Ṣamad al-Falimbānī, which refers to the prayers to be read for them when visiting their graves and also includes the dates of their *ḥawl* (anniversary of the death). Furthermore, as already mentioned earlier, the unnamed scribe refers to al-Falimbānī as *shaykhunā* (our teacher) and dates this copy on Friday, 27 Rajab 1266/8 June 1850.⁸⁹

As for the contents, the *Rātib* is a compilation of regular voluntary invocations from selections of the Qur'ān, the Prophetic traditions selected from the *ḥadīth*, and special litanies to be recited a certain number of times. It can be recited individually or in a *majlis* (assembly)

of *dhikr*. It also includes *awrād* received from as-Sammān to be recited after each of the five daily prayers (*Ṣubḥ*, *Zuhur*, *ʿAṣr*, *Maghrib* and *ʿIshāʾ*), and the aforementioned *ḥizb al-baḥr* and *ḥizb an-Nawawī*.⁹⁰ It is worth noting that just by comparing the size, the contents of the *Rātib* is more comprehensive than *al-ʿUrwat al-Wuthqā*, as they are written in eighty-seven and forty-one folios, respectively. As this is merely a compilation, it does not tell us much about the intellectual nature of ʿAbd aṣ-Ṣamad al-Falimbānī. However, the *Rātib* itself can perhaps help further to accentuate the stature of as-Sammān as a *Ṣūfī* master and perpetuate him in later generations.

The sixth title from the above listed writings of al-Falimbānī is *Naṣīḥat al-Muslimīn wa-Tadhkirat al-Muʾminīn fī Faḍāʾil al-Jihād fī Sabīl Allāh wa-Karāmat al-Mujāhidīn fī Sabīl Allāh* (Counsel to the Muslims and Reminder for the Believers on the Virtue of *Jihād* and the Dignity of the Fighters in the way of God), a fully Arabic work which, according to al-Falimbānī himself, was completed in Mecca. However, due to obliteration of the last two words the date of completion is illegible and only read: “*yawm as-sabt khāmis wa-ʿishrīn min shahr Jumādā al-Ūlā al-mubārak sanat alf wa-mīʾah ...*” (Saturday, 25 Jumādā al-Ūlā 11...). However, by calculation, I was able to figure the date as the 25 Jumādā al-Ūlā of 1187 which falls on Saturday. Therefore, this text was completed in Mecca, on Saturday, 25 Jumādā al-Ūlā 1187/14 August 1773 and evidently, the first dated work that tells us he was already a student of as-Sammān by this time.

With this date, we now have a better visualisation of al-Falimbānī's life and activities in Arabia. Since the discovery of the earlier mentioned two letters written by al-Falimbānī in Mecca, intended for the two Javanese princes which were intercepted by the Dutch authorities in Semarang, Indonesia, there have been no new findings on al-Falimbānī. Though Drewes provides us with the English translation of these letters, we do not have the originals of these letters since the discovered copies were the Dutch renditions of the Javanese translations of the original Arabic letters.⁹¹ Presumably both the Arabic and Javanese copies were destroyed and had never reached the intended princes. In addition, we cannot be certain that the translations were not influenced by preconceived ideas

of the colonial authorities as the issue dealt with was a delicate matter to the Colonising Dutch Government.

At this point, it is important to note that from the evidence that al-Falimbānī corresponds with the rulers of Java, Drewes unhesitatingly concluded that the anonymous treatise entitled *Tuhfat ar-Raghibin* was the work of al-Falimbānī on the behest of the Sultān of Palembang. However, as we shall see shortly, my research has found that both Voorhoeve and Drewes wrongfully attributed this text to him.

According to Drewes, the letters were translated in Semarang on 22 May 1772 [19 Šafar 1186].⁹² Thus, we can assume that al-Falimbānī wrote and dispatched these letters from Mecca at least several months earlier. It is probably because of his deep concern for his homeland, as I had shown earlier, that al-Falimbānī travelled back to the Malay Archipelago and arrived in Ramaḍān 1186/November 1772. However, based on the above new date of the completion of the *Naṣīḥat al-Muslimīn*, evidently he did not stay long. This, as I theorise, was perhaps due to intercepted letters that indicate his movement was constantly monitored by the Dutch. Reasonably, for his dissatisfaction with the Dutch encroachment, the treatment he received during his stay and concern for his homeland had probably inspired him to write this text upon his return to Mecca. Otherwise, the question can be asked as to what made al-Falimbānī suddenly write on *jihād* when we know that at this time he was inclining more towards Šūfism through his adherence to as-Sammān. On deeper analysis however, it suffices to say that evidently as-Sammān had never promoted any revivalist or reformist ideas through his works and teachings.

The *Naṣīḥat al-Muslimīn* has always been characterised by the Dutch as an invocation or incitement to *jihād* by fervent admonitions to holy war against infidels, so that Voorhoeve even described *jihād* as one of al-Falimbānī's 'specialities'.⁹³ Snouck Hurgronje maintains that this text had influenced the Achenese author, Nya' Aḥmad to compose a *hikāyat* of two thousand verses entitled *Nasihāt Ureuëng Muprang* in August 1894, which according to Snouck is a fanatical exhortation of all believers, in particular the Achehnese, to launch *jihād* against all unbelievers including the Dutch. He adds that Nya' Aḥmad ranked this as the highest religious obligation and considered the reward of *jihād* as

greater than any other good deed, although if one's *niyyah* (intention) is not free from the taint of worldly motives.⁹⁴ However, I could not verify this claim as I have not found a copy of this work. Further research should be done to critically analyse the content of this text as to what extent he did use al-Falimbānī's work as his source.

On the contrary, one can certainly argue that the general sense of dissatisfaction with conditions at the time, especially the interference of Western powers, particularly the Dutch East Indies Company in the Malay Archipelago, and a sense of hope for improvement and the courage of patriotism, was a more reasonable factor to inspire al-Falimbānī to write the *Naṣīhat al-Muslimīn*. Furthermore, this text is perhaps more appropriately considered a representation of al-Falimbānī's lament on the current political situation in the Archipelago, rather than a 'fanatical' call to *jihād*. It also indicates the growing repulsive stance of the '*ulamā*' against the Dutch regime as their presence in the Archipelago, though initially was solely for trade, later due to greed of monopolising and controlling the spice trade, had changed into efforts to subject the *Jāwī* archipelago to colonial rule.⁹⁵

Although the *Naṣīhat al-Muslimīn* was mentioned by everyone including Brockelmann above, it is clear that most scholars did not consult the text thoroughly, if at all.⁹⁶ At this point, it is important to point out that the only two known copies of this text exist in its manuscript form; both in Jakarta National Library.⁹⁷ I have primarily based my reading and research on the Leiden microfilm copy, a duplicate of one of these copies.⁹⁸ If earlier modern scholars had consulted the text, they would have seen that the contents were primarily excerpts from the Qur'ān and the Prophetic SAW traditions quoting from numerous *ḥadīth* sources including al-Bukhārī, at-Tirmidhī, Muslim, Abū Dāwūd, an-Nasā'ī, Ibn Ḥibbān, Ibn Mājah, al-'Uqaylī (perhaps from his *aḍ-Ḍu'afā' al-Kabīr*), Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal, at-Ṭabarānī, al-Ḥākim, as-Suyūṭī's *Ḥāshiyah 'alā Sunan an-Nasā'ī*, interpretation of Qur'ānic verses from *Tafsīr al-Bayḍāwī* and *Tafsīr al-Manāwī*, and other traditional works dealing with this subject, including ash-Sha'rānī's *Kashf al-Ghummah*, an-Nawawī's *Minhāj [at-Ṭālibīn]*, Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalānī's *Fath al-Bārī* cited twice, and Abū Nu'aym's *Ḥilyat [al-Awliyā' wa-Ṭabaqāt al-Asfiyā']*.⁹⁹

Close analysis of the text shows that al-Falimbānī explicitly clarifies the law of *jihād*, quoting an-Nawawī's *Minhāj* as an authoritative source, saying that if the *kuffār* occupied the land of Islam with the intention of destruction, *jihād* at that instant becomes an individual obligation (... *yakūn al-kuffār dakhālū balad al-Islām qāṣidīn kharābah, fa 'l-jihād hīna 'idhin farḍ 'ayn ...*).¹⁰⁰ Furthermore, al-Falimbānī clearly points out in his epilogue (*khātimah*) that most of the *ḥadīths* in his *Naṣīḥat al-Muslimīn* were excerpts from as-Suyūṭī's *al-Jāmi' aṣ-Ṣaghīr*, a collection of *ḥadīth qawli* (sayings of the Prophet SAW) of his *Jam' al-Jawāmi'*, with the addition of a number of *ḥadīth qawli* omitted from that work, 'Abd al-Wahhāb ash-Sha'rānī's *Kashf al-Ghummah 'an Jamī' al-Ummah* (Unveiling the Sorrow off the Whole Community), and principally relying on Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī's *Maslak ar-Rashād ilā 'l-Aḥādīth al-Wāridah fī Faḍl al-Jihād* (The Guided Path on the *Ḥadīths* Narrated on the merit of *Jihād*).¹⁰¹

Thus, from the above discussion I should like to argue that this text is not necessarily a series of fervent admonitions or fanatical exhortations to war against infidels but was rather a work of a scholar who was concerned about the aggression of intruders into his homeland (and Islamic lands generally) and simply compiling Islamic texts and explaining them to his people. If the latter was the case, then certainly this was among his contributions towards the intellectual development of life in the Malay Archipelago and an indication of his concern about the current political situation there. At the same time, it also highlights his deep concern and sense of responsibility for his *Jāwī* compatriots.

Perhaps other evidence indicating that there is a general sense of dissatisfaction with conditions as they were and a sense of hope for improvement can be seen from the writings of later generations of *Jāwī* scholars. For instance, Dāwūd al-Faṭānī also wrote explicitly on the topic of *jihād*. Though, unlike al-Falimbānī, he did not write a separate epistle specifically on *jihād*, but he included a lengthy chapter [*kitāb al-jihād*] in his work discussing its legality and obligation according to the Islamic law. In one of his later dated works, the *Sullam al-Mubtadī*, completed in Mecca on 13 Shawwāl 1252/21 January 1837, Dāwūd al-Faṭānī clarifies the rules of *jihād* stating the following:

A book clarifying the rules of *jihād*. The *jihād* became obligatory after the migration of the Prophet SAW to Medina. It is a communal obligation for the Muslims to engage in *jihād* every year, against the aggressions of the infidel if they are in their own land; if this is fulfilled by any of the Muslims, the rest are exempted from such obligation. On the other hand, if the infidels transgress by seizing Muslim lands, at that instant, the *jihād* becomes an individual obligation for every Muslim. It is the duty of every individual to rebut with whatever means possible, and it becomes obligatory for their neighbours to assist them in repulsing their enemy ... (*Kitab pada menyatakan perang sabil. Maka adalah dituntut akan dia kemudian daripada berpindah Nabi SAW ke Madinah. Jika adalah mereka itu kafir pada negerinya, maka perang akan dia fardu kifayah atas segala muslimin pada tiap-tiap tahun, maka jika ada yang mengerjakan itu, orang yang ada mereka itu ahli kifayah, gugur dosanya atas orang yang lainnya; dan kedua, jika masuk mereka itu kepada negeri kita, maka tatkala itu wajib jihād atas mereka itu. Wajib ahli negeri itu menolakan mereka itu seboleholehnya dan wajib segala negeri yang hampir dengan mereka itu menolakan dia ...*).¹⁰²

The last of the currently known writings of al-Falimbānī, is *Zād al-Muttaqīn fī Tawhīd Rabb al-'Ālamīn* (Sustenance for the Pious on the Oneness of the Lord of the Universe), already mentioned earlier.¹⁰³ As noted above, Quzwain was the first to add this title to the growing list of al-Falimbānī's writings; however, he stated that no copy of it had been found.¹⁰⁴ However, I was able to discover the only manuscript copy, thus far, of this text and it clearly indicates that the scribe was one of al-Falimbānī's disciples in Mecca as he refers to him as '*mawlānā wa-ustādhunā ash-Shaykh 'Abd aṣ-Ṣamad ... fī Makkah*,' though the scribe himself does not mention his own name, nor give any date of completion.¹⁰⁵

The *Zād al-Muttaqīn* is undated, however, al-Falimbānī quoted it twice in his *Sayr as-Sālikīn* which helps us to establish roughly the date it was written.¹⁰⁶ He states that he wrote this work as an exposition of the doctrine of *waḥdat al-wujūd* based on the first teachings he received from as-Sammān on this subject. He tells us further that after completion of this text, perhaps upon the instruction of as-Sammān, he read it to

Şiddīq b. 'Umar Khān al-Madanī who then named it *Zād al-Muttaqīn fī Tawḥīd Rabb al-'Ālamīn*.¹⁰⁷ Thus, we can conclude that he wrote it while he was studying with as-Sammān during his five year sojourn in Medina (1181-86/1766-72), and possibly in the early period of his study. This also indicates that al-Falimbānī was already a competent student who was permitted and able to learn the complex and advanced topics of Şūfism upon meeting him.

It is fortunate that not only can we confirm the attribution of this work to al-Falimbānī from the text itself, but also it precisely accords with the prologue of this text included in his *Sayr as-Sālikīn*.¹⁰⁸ Without doubt, the *Zād al-Muttaqīn* was his most significant writing on the doctrine of *waḥdat al-wujūd*, which summarises his advanced *taṣawwuf* training and clarifies this complex Şūfī doctrine. Fully aware of the possibility that this text and its like might lead to intellectual and religious confusion, al-Falimbānī clearly warns the novice (*mubtadī*) not to read such works, and explains further that without proper knowledge, such works might lead them astray or even to heresy.¹⁰⁹ Therefore, the *Zād al-Muttaqīn* was reserved for his adept disciples, which perhaps explains the rarity of its copy, since it was not widely circulated.

This further finds support in the scholarly writings of later generations such as Sayyid 'Uthmān the *mufī* of Batavia who relates that in conformity with the opinion of scholars of exoteric and esoteric sciences, and scholars of *sharī'ah* and *ḥaqīqah*, he forbids the reading of Şūfī texts that contain ambiguous phrases indicative of terminologies only comprehended by them, such as the question of *waḥdat al-wujūd* and the like, found in such books as *al-Ḥikam al-'Aṭā'īyyah*, *al-Futūḥāt al-Makiyyah*, and others ... its meaning cannot be perceived save by those who have reached their standing and tasted it by *dhawq* ... the cause of such prohibition is the inability of the uninitiated to comprehend their phrases and their intended meaning, this leading the general reader to atheism (*ilhād*), [ideas of] divine incarnation (*ḥulūl*) and of mystic union with God (*ittiḥād*).¹¹⁰

Such a view is also supported by other proponents of Şūfī mysticism such as 'Abd al-Ḥamīd Quds in his exposition of as-Sammān's *qaṣīdah* where he points out that numerous scholars have warned students against reading the profound teachings of *waḥdat al-wujūd* and the works of Şūfī

masters such as Ibn al-‘Arabī’s *al-Futūḥāt al-Makkiyyah* and his *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam*, albeit holding the opinion that he was one of the greatest *walī* and knower of God (*min akābir al-awliyā’ al-‘Ārifīn*). Furthermore he supports his opinion by quoting as authoritative sources as-Suyūṭī and Ibn Ḥajar al-Haytamī’s *al-Fatāwā al-Ḥadīthiyyah*, where the latter explains that this was only because of its “high complexity beyond the understanding of the masses and the ambiguity of its meaning in the minds of many” (*li-‘uhwihā ‘an fahm al-‘awām wa-ghumūd ma‘ānīhā ‘an kathīr min ‘l-fuhūm*).¹¹¹

Though al-Falimbānī tells us that his text was based on the first teachings on *waḥdat al-wujūd* by as-Sammān, it does not mean that he literally reproduced his teacher’s work. This is clear from several points: firstly, if we recall the works written by as-Sammān, none of his titles were specifically on *waḥdat al-wujūd*. Secondly, as in al-Falimbānī’s *Zahrāt al-Murīd*, it was his method to take notes from the lectures he attended based on his own understanding, thus usually including his own additions; thirdly, the major *Ṣūfī* works he listed for the adepts include several works on *waḥdat al-wujūd* such as an-Nābulusī’s *Īdāh al-Maqṣūd* and *Nukhbat al-Mas’alah*. It is highly probable that he read such works with as-Sammān as he was, according to al-Falimbānī, the highest *qutb* of his time. Finally, further research shows that several of his teachers and his grand-teachers (teachers of his teachers) had also written on the doctrine of *waḥdat al-wujūd* such as ‘Aṭā’ Allāh al-Miṣrī’s *Nafḥat al-Jūd fī Waḥdat al-Wujūd*, ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān al-‘Aydarūs’s *Laṭā’if al-Jūd fī Mas’alat Waḥdat al-Wujūd* and *Fayḍat an-Nafāḥāt fī Mas’alat aṣ-Ṣifāt*, Aḥmad al-Jawharī’s *Fayḍ al-‘Alī al-Wadūd fī Taḥqīq Mas’alat al-Wujūd*, Muṣṭafā al-Bakrī’s *Waḥdat al-Wujūd: al-‘Ilal wa ‘l-Asbāb* and *Mawrid al-‘Adhb li-Dhī ‘l-Wurūd fī Kashf Ma’nā Waḥdat al-Wujūd*, Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī’s *Maṭla’ al-Jūd fī Taḥqīq at-Tanzīh fī Waḥdat al-Wujūd* and an-Nābulusī’s *aṣ-Ṣifāt al-Mamdūd fī Ma’nā Waḥdat al-Wujūd* in addition to his two aforementioned titles. Thus, at this stage, it suffices to say that the *Zād al-Muttaqīn* must contain some of his own additions, or at least adaptations from his own readings, though further research needs to be done. Finally, it is important to highlight that the *waḥdat al-wujūd* al-Falimbānī professes is totally in conformity with the *sharī‘ah* and *uṣūl ad-dīn* as it clearly rejects the notion of *ḥulūl* and *ittiḥād*.¹¹²

Al-Falimbānī's Previous Unknown Writings

At this stage, it is necessary to reiterate, as already indicated in passing in our discussion of categories of sources consulted for this study, the importance of surveying the catalogues of oriental manuscripts as these often provide important information on those *'ulamā'* who have written books. This is certainly true in the case of al-Falimbānī as I found it a very useful tool in tracing and tracking down his writings, especially those which have never been consulted or mentioned in contemporary studies. Thus, this section will highlight and discuss all of these writings, eleven thus far, which have never been included in previous studies.

The first of these writings is *Risālah fī Bayān Asbāb Muḥarramāt an-Nikāḥ wa-mā Yudhkar ma'ahu min Ḍabṭ ar-Riḍā' wa-Ghayriḥ* (Epistle elucidating the reasons for prohibited marriage) written in *Jāwī*, which according to al-Falimbānī himself was completed in Mecca, on Tuesday 10 Rabī' al-Awwal 1179/27 August 1765.¹¹³ Looking at the date, this epistle was completed approximately two months after his first treatise, *Zahrat al-Murīd*.

As the title would indicate, this treatise deals with the law of marriage and the factors inhibiting marriage with certain relatives according to *sharī'ah* law. The main focus of the discussion centres on the three groups of women that a man is prohibited to marry due to *nasab* (kinship), *riḍā'* (fosterage) and *muṣāharah* (existing relationship by marriage) listing seven categories each for the first two groups and four for the third group. In my perusal of this text, I have discovered that a concise discussion of the same topic was later included by al-Falimbānī in his magnum opus, *Sayr as-Sālikīn*. However, he omits several *fiqh* questions included in his earlier epistle.¹¹⁴ This short text in three folios is an example of al-Falimbānī's erudition in *fiqh* and his intellectual contributions to the *sharī'ah* teachings in the Archipelago. Perhaps it is likely that al-Falimbānī wrote this epistle in response to a question by his compatriots, however, he does not indicate this in his text.

The second of the previously unknown writings of al-Falimbānī is *Risālah Laṭīfah fī Bayān al-Isrā' wa 'l-Mi'rāj* (A Small Epistle on Exposition of the Prophet's SAW Nocturnal Journey and Ascension).

Al-Falimbānī himself tells us that this epistle was completed in Mecca, on Friday, 11 Rajab 1181/3 December 1767, thus it is his third writing in chronological sequence, after his *Zahrat al-Murīd* and the above mentioned epistle on marriage.¹¹⁵ It is important to remember that this is the last of the three earliest dated writings of al-Falimbānī that does not mention as-Sammān, indicating that he was not his disciple yet.

There is no published edition of this epistle and thus far, I have located only three manuscript copies of it: two in the National Library of Malaysia and the third in the University of Leiden Library.¹¹⁶ This treatise deals with the narrative of the Prophet's SAW nocturnal journey from Mecca to Jerusalem and his ascension to heaven. Among the works of authoritative authors on this subject that al-Falimbānī quoted one Najm ad-Dīn al-Ghayṭī's (910-83/1504-76) *al-Isrā' wa 'l-Mi'rāj*, better known as *Qiṣṣat Mi'rāj an-Nabī*, and its commentary entitled *Sharḥ al-Mi'rāj* by Aḥmad al-Qalyūbī (d. 1029/1619).¹¹⁷ Both authors were from Egypt. It is probable that al-Falimbānī relied mostly on these two works as he concludes his writing saying that he finishes translating this epistle in Mecca (*wa-kāna al-farāgh min tarjamat hādhihī ar-risālat fī Makkah al-Musharrafah ...*).¹¹⁸

We know from the *Zahrat al-Murīd* that al-Falimbānī was already teaching his students when he wrote it and the date of completion of *Risālah Laṭīfah* further supports this. In fact, it is probable that al-Falimbānī was teaching at al-Masjīd al-Ḥarām by that time. We can relate this to Snouck Hurgronje's observation, that only during the seventh Hijri month, Rajab, that one hour of the day, usually after the sunset, lectures are allocated for the edifying recitations of the Prophet's SAW journey to Heaven, the anniversary of which is on the twenty seventh of that month.¹¹⁹ Thus, perhaps, it is not a coincidence that al-Falimbānī completed his writing in the month of Rajab, about a fortnight before the celebrations of the *Mi'rāj* night.

Among al-Falimbānī's contemporaries who benefited from the *Risālah Laṭīfah* was Dāwūd al-Faṭānī. He quoted from this epistle in his own writing dealing with the same subject entitled *Kifāyat al-Muḥtāj fī 'l-Isrā' wa 'l-Mi'rāj* which he completed in Mecca on 27 Muḥarram 1224/14 March 1809, some forty years after al-Falimbānī completed his own treatise.¹²⁰

The third from among the list of al-Falimbānī's previously unutilised writings is *Mulḥaq fī Bayān al-Fawā'id an-Nāfi'ah fī 'l-Jihād fī Sabīl Allāh* (Annex to the Exposition of the Useful Benefits of Striving in the Way of God).¹²¹ Unfortunately, the last page from the only known existing manuscript copy is missing, thus it is uncertain whether al-Falimbānī dated this work or not. However, the title itself indicates that he wrote it after his previous epistle on *jihād*. Analysing the *Mulḥaq* clearly shows that it is a *Jāwī* translation of the Arabic *mulḥaq* (annex) included in his *Naṣīḥat al-Muslimīn*, perhaps intended for and requested by his *Jāwī* compatriots who do not understand Arabic. The *Mulḥaq* includes four *fawā'id* (benefits) containing several Qur'ānic verses and supplications to be recited at specific times, which according to al-Falimbānī will give benefits and provide protection during *jihād*.¹²²

The fourth title among the newly identified writings of al-Falimbānī is an epistle on Islamic jurisprudence entitled *Risālah fī Bayān Ḥukm ash-Shar' wa-Bayān man Yukhālifuḥu fī 'l-'Itiqād aw fī 'l-Ḥukm aw fī 'l-'Amal* (Epistle on the exposition of the legal ruling and those contradicting it regarding belief, juristic ruling or action). According to al-Falimbānī himself, this epistle was completed in Mecca, on Sunday, 10 Rajab 1201/28 April 1787.¹²³ Thus far, I have located only two existing copies of this text.¹²⁴

Though al-Falimbānī is chiefly known as a *Ṣūfī* scholar on the basis of his acclaimed work, *Sayr as-Sālikīn* and his affiliation with the Sammāniyyah *ṭarīqah*, it is now evident that he was also a scholar of jurisprudence with at least two epistles (*Risālah fī Bayān Asbāb Muḥarramāt an-Nikāḥ* and *Risālah fī Bayān Ḥukm ash-Shar'*) written specifically on *fiqh* in addition to numerous *masā'il fiqhiyyah* (diverse questions on jurisprudence) in his other writings. In fact, his strong inclination towards *taṣawwuf* does not exclude his genuine interest in *fiqh* as al-Falimbānī completed writing his work of *fiqh* in between working on his third and fourth volumes of his *Sayr as-Sālikīn*. This is perhaps why apart from referring to al-Falimbānī as a *Ṣūfī*, al-Fādānī also refers to him as '*al-'Allāmah*' and '*al-Faqīh*' ash-Shaykh 'Abd aṣ-Ṣamad.¹²⁵ This is not unique among *Ṣūfīs*.

The *Risālah fī Bayān Ḥukm ash-Shar'* deals with a detailed explanation of *sharī'ah* law and its two parts, the first, *al-ḥukm ash-*

shar'ī at-taklīfī, obligations of the believer according to Islamic Law which includes its five essential levels: *wājib* (compulsory), *sunnah* (meritorious or recommended), *ḥarām* (forbidden), *makrūh* (disliked or not recommended) and *mubāḥ* (permissible). The second part, *al-ḥukm ash-shar'ī al-waḍ'ī* (positional or situational legal rulings) also with five components: *sabab* (cause), *shart* (condition), *mānī'* (hindrance), *ṣaḥīḥ* (valid) and *fāsid* (invalid).¹²⁶ Among Islamic scholars whom al-Falimbānī quoted as authoritative in this *Risālah* include Zakariyyā al-Anṣārī, al-Bayḍāwī's *Tafsīr*, Ibn Ḥajar al-Haytamī's [*al-I'lām bi-*] *Qawāṭi'* *al-Islām*, and *az-Zawājir* [*'an Iqtirāf al-Kabā'ir*], and al-Ghazālī's *Iḥyā' 'Ulūm ad-Dīn*, and *Kitāb al-Arba'īn fī Uṣūl ad-Dīn*.¹²⁷ This epistle demonstrates al-Falimbānī's erudition in *fiqh*. However, further research needs to be done on this work.

The next two writings of al-Falimbānī which were previously unknown are *ar-Risālah fī Kayfiyyat Rātīb Laylat al-Jum'ah* (Epistle on the modality of the Friday Night Invocation) and *Kayfiyyat Khatm Yawm ar-Rabū' fī Waqt al-'Aṣr* (Modality of the completion of Qur'ān recitation on Wednesday afternoon). Al-Falimbānī wrote both of these works in Arabic.¹²⁸ However, similar to his other collections of spiritual Qur'ānic verses, supplications and litanies, he does not provide any date or place of completion for either work, although he mentions his teacher, as-Sammān in them which indicates that he was already his student by the time he wrote them. Thus, he probably wrote them in Medina and initially intended them for his personal use and they were later handed down to his disciples.

Since both works are only compilations of litanies and supplications to be recited on the Friday night and at the completion of Qur'ān recitation on the afternoon of Wednesday, they do not constitute works of scholarly nature, and this perhaps explains the absence of indication of place and date of writing.

Another undated work of al-Falimbānī is a short compilation of supplications entitled *Du'ā' al-Musabbā'āt al-'Ashar* (The litany of the Ten Septuple) which is two pages long.¹²⁹ This treatise is a form of *wird* (litany) which has been practiced not only by al-Falimbānī himself but also by other *Ṣūfī* scholars as stated by al-Amīr al-Kabīr, al-Kattānī and Ibn 'Abidīn.¹³⁰ In fact, 'Abd Allāh ash-Sharqāwī attributed the

al-Musabba'āt al-'Ashar to Muḥammad b. Sulaymān al-Jazūlī (or al-Juzūlī, d. 870/1465), the Maghribī Ṣūfī considered the *walī* of Marrakesh, renowned chiefly for his *Dalā'il al-Khayrāt* (Guidelines for Blessings).¹³¹ However, al-Falimbānī explains that the litany of *al-Musabba'āt al-'Ashar* he practiced was received directly from his teacher Muḥammad as-Sammān, who in turn received it from his teacher 'Aṭīyyat Allāh [as-Sindī], who received it from Khidr, who in turn received it directly from the Prophet SAW.¹³² The *al-Musabba'āt al-'Ashar* of al-Jazūlī on the other hand and according to ash-Sharqāwī, was given by Khidr to Ibrāhīm al-Taymī (d. 94/713).¹³³ Thus, al-Falimbānī's version of *al-Musabba'āt al-'Ashar* seems different from the others in its chain of transmission and to a certain extent in its contents which reflect a variation in the order of wording and contains some additions.

The *al-Musabba'āt al-'Ashar* contains ten sections, including verses from the Qur'ān, blessings on the Prophet SAW and supplications to be recited seven times each. Three different copies of this treatise have been located: one held by the National Library of Malaysia, another at the University of Leiden Library and a personally inherited copy located in Palembang. However, I was only able to consult the first two copies and have to be satisfied regarding the third by its description provided in the *Catalogue of Palembang Manuscripts*.¹³⁴ The colophon of the copy in Malaysia clearly indicates that it was copied on Saturday afternoon ('*aṣr hari Sabtu*) in Shawwāl 1219/January 1805 in Karangkali; although I have not been able to identify this place, it is perhaps in Java, Indonesia.¹³⁵

It is important to highlight the fact that al-Falimbānī himself mentioned *al-Musabba'āt* at least twice in two of his other works, namely his *al-'Urwat al-Wuthqā* and *Sayr as-Sālikīn*.¹³⁶ Perhaps this text was written by al-Falimbānī upon receiving it from as-Sammān and was later included in his above works.

The eighth text from among the list of al-Falimbānī's previously unknown writings is *an-Nūr al-Aḥmad fī Asānīd ash-Shaykh 'Abd aṣ-Ṣamad* (The Praise worthy Light on 'Abd aṣ-Ṣamad's Chains of Transmission), which is his *thabat*. This title has never been mentioned in previous studies, indicating that it was unknown to contemporary scholars. It was al-Fādānī himself who stated that al-Falimbānī compiled a *thabat* with the above title, stating that he read it with Mukhtār b.

'Aṭārid al-Jāwī, who in turn had read it with 'Umar b. Ṣāliḥ as-Samārānī, who read it with his own father, who himself in turn had read it with the author, Shaykh 'Abd aṣ-Ṣamad b. 'Abd ar-Raḥmān al-Falimbānī.¹³⁷ However, it is unfortunate that I have not been able to locate any existing manuscript copy or published edition of this work. Perhaps al-Fādānī himself possessed a copy of it, since he had read it, and as I had pointed earlier, most of his own works and other scholars' works are still kept unpublished in his private library in Mecca.

Nevertheless, from al-Fādānī's *isnāds* scattered throughout his writings connecting him through his teachers with al-Falimbānī, we can extract the latter's *isnāds* which must have been part of his *thabat*. However, we should remember that al-Fādānī does not specifically compile or list his *isnāds* which not only link him to al-Falimbānī but also to other Jāwī scholars. Thus, what is available from his writings is only some of al-Falimbānī's *isnāds*, which I have utilised to extract a comprehensive list of his teachers and students. It is interesting to point out that on consulting numerous *isnād* works of al-Fādānī, none of the renowned Jāwī scholars of the late sixteenth century such as Ḥamzah al-Fanṣūrī and Shams ad-Dīn as-Sumatrānī, and of the seventeenth century such as Nūr ad-Dīn ar-Rānīrī, 'Abd ar-Ra'ūf as-Sinkīlī, and Yūsuf al-Maqassārī made their appearance in such *isnāds*. This leads my theory regarding the transmission of knowledge, that in the early period of Islamic intellectual development in the Malay Archipelago, *isnāds* were not given significant attention. As observed from the early Jāwī scholarly literature, *isnāds* were applied in a narrow context, as a means of confirming legitimate affiliation to a particular *Ṣūfī ṭarīqah* by providing the *silsilah ṭarīqah*, demonstrating a person as a valid transmitter of such *ṭarīqah*.

We can also relate the testimony of his disciple 'Abd ar-Raḥmān al-Ahdal as evidence indicating that al-Falimbānī must have had numerous *isnāds*. Al-Ahdal states that after reading the beginning of every quarter of the *Iḥyā'* with al-Falimbānī, he requested from him an *ijāzah* for this work. Al-Ahdal was granted a lengthy *ijāzah* written in al-Falimbānī's own noble writing (*fa-ajāzanī wa-kataba lī bi-khaṭṭihī ash-sharīf ijāzah muṭawwalah*).¹³⁸ Thus, we can certainly conclude that al-Falimbānī himself must have read the *Iḥyā'* with several teachers, possessing various

isnāds going back to al-Ghazālī. Furthermore, if this was true for the *Iḥyā'*, one can deduce that he also had *isnāds* in other Islamic religious sciences, especially *ḥadīth* works which as a rule are narrated and handed down to later generations with complete *isnāds*.

It is important to recall here what we have seen in previous chapters; that most of al-Falimbānī's teachers, their teachers, his own contemporaries and later generations, all list their teachers and *isnāds* in their own *ṭabats*.¹³⁹ All of them are scholars of *ḥadīth* or affiliated with the study of *ḥadīth*. As al-Falimbānī himself authored *an-Nūr al-Aḥmad*, we can deduce that he must have been a scholar of *ḥadīth* or affiliated to the discipline. This finds support from the inclusion of his biographical entry in Ṣiddīq al-Qannūjī's *at-Tāj al-Mukallal*, which according to the author was written to compile a group of scholars who have affiliation with the science of *Ḥadīth*.¹⁴⁰ In addition, I have mentioned above that al-Falimbānī wrote an Arabic *al-'Urwat al-Wuthqā* containing *ḥadīth* on the merits of *dhikr* and the call to increase it, plus his *Naṣīḥat al-Muslimīn* which included numerous Prophetic SAW traditions quoted from numerous *ḥadīth* sources. It is also important to note that later generations of *Jāwī* scholars, including women, continued the scholarly tradition, compiling their own *ṭabats*.¹⁴¹

The ninth writing of al-Falimbānī unknown to those who dealt previously with his scholarship is *Faḍā'il al-Iḥyā' li 'I-Ghazālī* (The Virtues of Revival [of the Religious Sciences] by al-Ghazālī). This is attributed to him by two contemporary Arab scholars from Damascus: Muḥammad Bahjat al-Bayṭār (d. 1396/1976) and 'Umar Riḍā Kaḥḥālāh (d. 1408/1987).¹⁴² However, neither provides us with further details or any description of this work. Unfortunately, I have not been able to locate any existing copy. Nevertheless, from the title itself, this work probably discusses the merits of al-Ghazālī's *Iḥyā'* – one of the major *taṣawwuf* works al-Falimbānī had focused most of his studying and teaching.¹⁴³

There exists also a poem attributed to al-Falimbānī on Kedah's victory against Siamese occupation. The untitled ten-line poem written in Arabic was inscribed on a red silk banner, which according to Wan Shamsudin Yusof was unearthed from the inheritance of Dato' Pekerma Wan Muhammad Ali's descendants in Padang Matsirat, Langkawi, Kedah in 1958. Yusof himself gave a Malay title to this collection as

Puisi Kemenengan Kedah (poem on Kedah's victory). The banner was later donated to the Kedah State Museum and since then has been kept as part of the national heritage. Yusof believes that this poem was written by al-Falimbānī who was somehow involved in the Kedah war against Siam. He adds that the banner was used by Dato' Pekerna during this war led by Tunku Muḥammad Sa'd in 1838-39.¹⁴⁴ The rhyming poem reads as follows:¹⁴⁵

After the *basmalah* and verses from *Surat al-Faṭḥ* (the Victory, Qur'ān 48:1-3)

qul li - 'l-malik ibn 'l-malik
 say to the king son of the king,
wa-man li-abwāb al-jinān bi-sayfihi qaṭ'an fataḥ
 and he who opened the door of the heaven with his sword,
lazilta 'Abdan li-Allāh yā ghayth al-warā
 you are servant of God, as the rain for the creatures,
yā as'ad man as'ad ḥaqqan naṣaḥ
 happiness is for those who counsel rightness,
badr al-hudā ḥaqqan badā bushrā lanā
 the right guidance shone like a full moon giving us glad tidings,
yā ma'shar 'l-islām qad nilnā al-faraḥ
 O the people of Islam, we have attained the delights,
hādihā huwa al-ḥaṣ al-ladhī man [nālahu]
 this is the fortune that who ever attained it,
nāla as-sa'ādah wa 's-siyādah wa 'l-minaḥ
 had attained happiness, sovereignty and gift
ḥalidhā badā khatm al-futūḥ mu'arrikhan
 the seal of victories had emerged, dated
bi 'n-naṣr wa 'l-Islām qad fāzat Kedah
 with triumph and Islam, Kedah prevailed.
 373 169 104 488 112¹⁴⁶
sanah 1246 (year 1246)

Although Yusof believes that the poem was written in 1254/1838, the last verse which gives the date clearly shows that it was written in 1246/1831.¹⁴⁷ Thus, this banner must have been used during the uprising led by Tunku Kudin (in 1246/1831) when he and his supporters initially

and successfully drove the Siamese out and regained control over Kedah. Since it was believed that Dato' Pekerma used this banner during the war led by Tunku Muḥammad Sa'd, it must have been handed down to him as he used it in the second uprising in 1254/1838.

However, I have demonstrated earlier that al-Falimbānī was present in Kedah only during the second uprising in 1254/1838, and if these Arabic poems were indeed written by al-Falimbānī in 1246/1831, they were probably written in Mecca and sent back to Kedah. However, Yusof's attribution of this work to al-Falimbānī remains only a probability unless further evidence can be unearthed which supports or contradicts this.

Writings Erroneously Attributed to Al-Falimbānī

As indicated earlier, there are at least two epistles wrongfully attributed to al-Falimbānī, namely *Anīs al-Muttaqīn* and *Tuhfat ar-Rāghibīn*. The first, *Anīs al-Muttaqīn* was written in Arabic and was authored by 'Abd aṣ-Ṣamad b. Faqīh Ḥusayn b. Faqīh Muḥammad. As already mentioned earlier, Shaghir Abdullah is the only scholar who attributes this epistle to al-Falimbānī, further considering Faqīh Ḥusayn to be his father.¹⁴⁸ Abdullah claims that his attribution is based on a manuscript copy in his personal collection.¹⁴⁹

Voorhoeve strongly repudiated this attribution, pointing out that in a lithographed edition of *Anīs al-Muttaqīn* with interlinear translation in Javanese, the *nisbah* al-Falimbānī is added to the author's name on the title page, but not in the text itself.¹⁵⁰ He suggests that the ascription to 'Abd aṣ-Ṣamad al-Falimbānī is probably an attempt to make the book popular in the Malay Archipelago.¹⁵¹ I agree fully with this conclusion, as all manuscript copies without the Javanese translation do not carry the *nisbah* al-Falimbānī, and thus, this indicates clearly the publisher's intention to popularise the text by adding this *nisbah*.¹⁵² This also highlights al-Falimbānī's popularity in that his name was widely known in the Archipelago to the extent that it was used to promote a published Islamic text in Javanese.

According to both al-Baghdādī and Kaḥḥālāh, *Anīs al-Muttaqīn* was the work of 'Abd aṣ-Ṣamad b. al-Faqīh, a *Ṣūfī* who completed it in 1175/1761.¹⁵³ Looking at the date of completion alone, this is enough evidence to show that it was not the work of al-Falimbānī as his first dated work, the *Zahrāt al-Murīd* was completed in 1178/1765. Furthermore, Kaḥḥālāh himself distinguishes clearly between these two authors. He credits al-Falimbānī with *Fadā'il al-Iḥyā'* under the entry of 'Abd aṣ-Ṣamad al-Jāwī, and attributes *Anīs al-Muttaqīn* to 'Abd aṣ-Ṣamad al-Faqīh in a different entry.¹⁵⁴ In addition, textual analysis gives the impression that the author of *Anīs al-Muttaqīn*, 'Abd aṣ-Ṣamad b. Faqīh Ḥusayn was very likely to have been an Arab scholar due to the eloquent Arabic demonstrated in the work. Further evidence to support the conclusion that this is a wrongful attribution is that 'Abd ar-Raḥīm al-Jāwī al-Ashī translated the *Anīs al-Muttaqīn* into *Jāwī* which he titled *Hidāyat al-Muttaqīn*, stating that it was taken from the work of 'Abd aṣ-Ṣamad b. Faqīh Ḥusayn (*fa-allafu hādha al-kitāb fa-akhadhahu [sic] min qawl 'Abd aṣ-Ṣamad b. Faqīh Ḥusayn min al-'ilm as-sālik ilā Allāh ... wa-sammaytuhu Hidāyat al-Muttaqīn*).¹⁵⁵ However, 'Abd ar-Raḥīm al-Ashī himself does not attribute *Anīs al-Muttaqīn* to al-Falimbānī, which he would have otherwise indicated if it was the latter's work.

The second wrongly attributed writing to al-Falimbānī is *Tuḥfat ar-Rāghibīn*, a Malay epistle written by an anonymous author in 1188/1774. Despite being anonymous, Voorhoeve was the first to attribute this epistle to 'Abd aṣ-Ṣamad al-Falimbānī. He attempts to support his claim by providing five pieces of evidence; the strongest is perhaps that al-Falimbānī usually dated his writings ranging from 1178/1764 to 1203/1788.¹⁵⁶

Building upon Voorhoeve's ascription, Drewes conclusively attributes the *Tuḥfat ar-Rāghibīn* to al-Falimbānī after his two letters written to the princes of Java were unearthed. Based on the evidence that al-Falimbānī maintained contact with the Malay Archipelago, Drewes unhesitatingly concluded that al-Falimbānī wrote this epistle at the request of the Sultān of Palembang.¹⁵⁷ Later scholars including Quzwain and Azra simply followed Drewes in attributing this work to al-Falimbānī.¹⁵⁸ In his article on Sayyid 'Uthmān al-Batāwī, a famous Hadhrami Scholar in Indonesia, Azra himself does not seem to realize that al-Batāwī clearly

credited the *Tuhfat ar-Rāghibīn* to Arshad al-Banjārī.¹⁵⁹ Thus, he fails to investigate the issue of attribution further.

However, my own findings strongly contradict Voorhoeve's and Drewes's attribution of the *Tuhfat* to al-Falimbānī. Numerous pieces of evidence indicate that this anonymous treatise was in fact authored by Muḥammad Arshad al-Banjārī. The first piece of evidence is that Arshad al-Banjārī's own maternal grandson, 'Abd ar-Raḥmān Ṣiddīq al-Banjārī and the aforementioned 'Uthmān al-Batāwī both pointed out that Arshad authored *Tuhfat ar-Rāghibīn*.¹⁶⁰ Further research reveals that there were three epistles carrying the title *Tuhfat ar-Rāghibīn*: the first, *Tuhfat ar-Rāghibīn fī Bayān Ḥaqīqat Ḍmān al-Mu'minīn wa-mā Yufsiduhu min Riddat al-Murtaddīn* by an anonymous author, but completed in 1188/1774, the second, *Tuhfat ar-Rāghibīn fī Sulūk Ṭarīqat al-Muttaqīn* completed in Mecca in 1230/1814 by Shaykh Dāwūd al-Faṭānī, the third and last, *Tuhfat ar-Rāghibīn fī Taqlīd al-Qawl bi-Ṣiḥḥat 'l-Jum'ah bidūn 'l-Arba'in* authored by Shaykh Ḥusayn b. Sulaymān al-Funtīānī, completed in Mecca in 1319/1902. Since the authors of the last two *Tuhfats* are clearly known, this leaves us with the anonymous *Tuhfat* which was indeed the work of Arshad al-Banjārī.

The second piece of evidence is that Dāwūd al-Faṭānī clearly indicates in his *Tuhfat ar-Rāghibīn fī Sulūk Ṭarīqat al-Muttaqīn* that the *Tuhfat ar-Rāghibīn fī Bayān Ḥaqīqat Ḍmān al-Mu'minīn* was authored by his older contemporary, Muḥammad Arshad al-Banjārī as he says: "*maka disebut oleh yang ampunya karangan Tuhfat ar-Rāghibīn fī Bayān Ḥaqīqat Ḍmān al-Mu'minīn bagi al-'Alīm al-Fāḍil al-'Allāmah Shaykh Muḥammad Arshad.*"¹⁶¹ It is important to emphasize that al-Faṭānī completed his *Tuhfat* in Mecca in 1230/1814; two years after al-Banjārī's death in 1227/1812. Without doubt, al-Faṭānī knew al-Banjārī and his works better than those from later generations, as both scholars lived in the same period. Thus, from this evidence alone it is enough to prove that the anonymous *Tuhfat* was the work of Arshad al-Banjārī and not al-Falimbānī.

Drewes's assumption that the *Tuhfat* was written upon the request of the Sulṭān of Palembang itself strongly contradicts Ṣiddīq al-Banjārī. The latter tells us that his grandfather, Arshad al-Banjārī authored the *Tuhfat ar-Rāghibīn fī Bayān Ḥaqīqat [Ḍmān] al-Mu'minīn wa-[mā Yufsiduhu*

min] *Riddat al-Murtaddīn* (providing the full title) upon the request of Sulṭān Taḥmīd Allāh ath-Thānī b. Sulṭān Tamjīd Allāh al-Awwal (r. 1778–1808), the Sulṭān of Banjar.¹⁶² In addition to these, several other pieces of evidence (eight to be precise)¹⁶³ clearly show that Arshad al-Banjārī authored the *Tuḥfat*. However, the pieces of evidence discussed above suffice to prove the wrong attribution of *Tuḥfat* to al-Falimbānī.

In addition, another writing attributed to al-Falimbānī is a compendium of al-Burhānpūrī's *at-Tuḥfah al-Mursalāh* entitled *an-Nukhbat al-Muḥdāh min 'r-Raḥmat al-Muḥdāh 'Alayhi 'ṣ-Ṣalāt wa 's-Salām min Allāh* (The chosen gift emanating from God the Compassionate and bestowed on the Prophet SAW).¹⁶⁴ Among modern scholars who attributed this work to al-Falimbānī was Oman Fathurahman, who assumes its title was '*Mulakhkhaṣ li al-Tuḥfah al-Mursalāh*,' claimed to be given by the author himself.¹⁶⁵ Apart from the wrong title, Fathurahman does not provide any evidence to support his claim.¹⁶⁶ However, the correct title of this epistle according to the author himself is *an-Nukhbat al-Muḥdāh* as he says "*falammā marrat 'alayya at-Tuḥfat al-Mursalāh ... khaṭar fī 'l-bāl naskhihā bi-talkhiṣ lafẓihā ... fa-sammaytu al-mulakhkhaṣ [bi-] 'n-Nukhbat al-Muḥdāh min 'r-Raḥmat al-Muḥdāh 'Alayhi 'ṣ-Ṣalāt wa 's-Salām min Allāh.*"¹⁶⁷

The undated *an-Nukhbat* is written in Arabic with an interlinear *Jāwī* translation with the only known existing manuscript copy being bound with the earlier mentioned *Zād al-Muttaqīn*. However, unlike the latter, this work does not include the author's name, which leaves its status and attribution inconclusive. Unlike all of al-Falimbānī's other writings on *taṣawwuf*, this epistle does not mention as-Sammān at all; in fact, all al-Falimbānī's works written while or after studying with as-Sammān never fail to include this teacher's name.

Textual analysis indicates that the summarizer was 'Abd Allāh b. Ibrāhīm Mīrghani as it says "*wa-yaqūl al-mulakhkhiṣ 'Abd Allāh b. Ibrāhīm Mīrghani...*"¹⁶⁸ In addition, Nafīs al-Banjārī quoted 'Abd Allāh Mīrghani's work three times in his *ad-Durr an-Nafīs*, describing it as a summary of *at-Tuḥfat al-Mursalāh* without providing any title.¹⁶⁹ However, close analysis of both works makes it clear that al-Banjārī's citations were indeed from the *an-Nukhbat*. Thus, I am able to confirm that this treatise is the work of 'Abd Allāh Mīrghani and not al-Falimbānī.

It is worth noting that none of Mīrghānī's biographers ever mentioned *an-Nukhbat al-Muḥdāh* among his works, indicating that it is unknown to them. However, whoever wrote the interlinear *Jāwī* translation remains an open question.

Current Chronological Sequence of Al-Falimbānī's Writings

Having discussed the writings of al-Falimbānī at length and in detail, we can now arrange his works in a chronological sequence, at the same time showing his various stages of development before he reached his apex of writing and teaching. Apart from his undated writings, which we now know were written in Medina but still remain difficult to arrange precisely, all of his writings can be chronologically listed as follows:

1. *Zahrat al-Murīd fī Bayān Kalimat at-Tawḥīd* (23 Dhū al-Ḥijjah 1178/12 June 1765)
2. *Risālah fī Bayān Asbāb Muḥarramāt an-Nikāḥ* (10 Rabī' al-Awwal 1179/27 August 1765)
3. *Risālah Laṭīfah fī Bayān al-Isrā' wa 'l-Mi'rāj* (11 Rejab 1181/3 December 1767)
4. Two letters addressed to two Princes of Java [19 Ṣafār 1186/22 May 1772.
5. *Naṣīḥat al-Muslimīn wa-Tadhkirat al-Mu'minīn fī Faḍā'il al-Jihād fī Sabīl Allāh wa-Karāmat al-Mujāhidīn fī Sabīl Allāh* (25 Jumādā al-Ūlā 1187/14 August 1773)
6. *Mulḥaq fī Bayān al-Fawā'id an-Nāfi'ah fī 'l-Jihād fī Sabīl Allāh* (undated)
7. *Du'ā' al-Musabba'āt al-'Ashar* (undated)
8. *al-'Urwat al-Wuthqā wa-Silsilat al-Walī al-Atqā* (undated)
9. *Rātīb Shaykh 'Abd aṣ-Ṣamad al-Falimbānī* (undated)
10. *Kayfiyyat fī Khatm Yawm ar-Rabū' fī Waqt al-'Aṣr* (not dated)
11. *ar-Risālah fī Kayfiyyat Rātīb Laylat al-Jum'ah* (undated)
12. *Zād al-Muttaqīn fī Tawḥīd Rabb al-'Ālamīn* (undated)
13. *Hidāyat as-Sālikīn fī Sulūk Maslak al-Muttaqīn* (5 Muḥarram 1192/3 February 1778)

14. *Risālah fī Bayān Ḥukm ash-Shar' wa-Bayān man Yukhālifuḥu fī 'l-'Iṭiqād aw fī 'l-Ḥukm aw fī 'l-'Amal* (10 Rajab 1201/28 April 1787)
15. *Sayr as-Sālikīn ilā 'Ibādat Rabb al-'Ālamīn* (vol. 1, 1193-94/1779-80; vol. 2, 19 Ramaḍān 1195/8 September 1781; vol. 3, 19 Ṣafar 1197/22 January 1783; vol. 4, 20 Ramaḍān 1203/14 June 1789)
16. *an-Nūr al-Aḥmad fī Asānīd ash-Shaykh 'Abd aṣ-Ṣamad* (has not been located)
17. *Faḍā'il al-Iḥyā' Li 'l-Ghazālī* (has not been located)
18. *Puisi Kemenengan Kedah* (Poems on Kedah's victory) (1246/1831)

Endnotes

- ¹ See appendix 2.
- ² See Voorhoeve, "'Abd al-Samad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Palimbānī,'" vol. 1, p. 92.
- ³ See El-Muhammady, "The Islamic concept of education," p. 62.
- ⁴ See Brockelmann, *GAL (S)*, vol. II, p. 629.
- ⁵ See Drewes, *Directions for travellers*, pp. 222-4.
- ⁶ See Quzwain, *Mengenal Allah*, pp. 19-30.
- ⁷ See al-Falimbānī, *Zahrāt al-Murīd*, p. 2.
- ⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 2, 11.
- ⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 2.
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*
- ¹¹ See al-Falimbānī, *Zahrāt al-Murīd*, pp. 5-7.
- ¹² *Ibid.*, p. 5.
- ¹³ On Ibn Ḥajar al-Haytamī see Arendonk, C. van. "Ibn Ḥadjar al-Haytamī, Abu 'l-'Abbās Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. 'Alī b. Ḥadjar, Shihāb al-Dīn, al-Haytamī (not al-Haythamī) al-Sa'dī" in *EP*, edited by P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel and W.P. Heinrichs (Leiden, E. J. Brill), vol. III, p. 778.
- ¹⁴ See al-Falimbānī, *Zahrāt al-Murīd*, p. 6.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 7.
- ¹⁷ See al-Ahdal, *an-Nafas al-Yamānī*, p. 140.

- 18 Contrary to Chambert-Loir's conclusion, who maintains that copies of this work are scarce as only three copies were available (one in the University of Leiden Library and the remaining two in the Jakarta Museum, respectively), I found that manuscript copies of this work were abundantly available and can be found deposited in most of the libraries holding Malay *Jāwī* manuscripts, such as the Islamic Arts Museum of Malaysia, which holds five copies, the National Library of Malaysia, holding at least two copies, the University of Leiden itself actually possess two copies. Furthermore, I was able to acquire an early published edition of *Zahrat*, printed in Mecca by Maṭba'at al-Taraqqī al-Mājidīyyah in 1331/1921, upon which I have primarily based my reading and research. Cf. Chambert-Loir, "Abdussamad Al-Falimbani Sebagai Ulama Jawi," p. x; bibliography.
- 19 See El-Muhammady, "The Islamic Concept of Education," p. 60.
- 20 He repeats the same statement in Malay, see al-Falimbānī, *Hidāyat as-Sālikīn*, p. 3.
- 21 See al-Falimbānī, *Hidāyat as-Sālikīn*, pp. 3, 4, 6, 23, 28, 31, 35, 37, 50, 64, 104, *passim*.
- 22 *Ibid*, pp. 109, 111, 112,
- 23 *Ibid*, p. 27.
- 24 *Ibid*, pp. 12, 19, 29, 31, 37, 40, 49. The 'Umdat al-Muhtājīn itself is written in Arabic and *Jāwī*.
- 25 *Ibid*, p. 26.
- 26 *Ibid*, p. 28.
- 27 *Ibid*, p. 51.
- 28 *Ibid*, p. 46.
- 29 See al-Falimbānī, *Hidāyat as-Sālikīn*, p. 66.
- 30 For further information on these additions, compare the table of contents between al-Falimbānī, *Hidāyat as-Sālikīn*, pp. 1-4 and al-Ghazālī, Abū Ḥāmid [Muḥammad b. Muḥammad], *Bidāyat al-Hidāyah* (Egypt, Maktabat al-Jundī, 1384/1964), pp. 266-8.
- 31 See al-Falimbānī, *Sayr as-Sālikīn*, vol. 1, pp. 9, 216, 227; vol. 4, pp. 179, 262.
- 32 Cf. al-Falimbānī, *Hidāyat as-Sālikīn* (1st edition, Egypt, [al-Maṭba'at al-Miṣriyyah], 1298/1881), pp. 338-9; *idem*, *op. cit.* (Bombay, al-Maṭba'at al-Ḥasanīyyah, 1311/1893), pp. 1, 346-7; *idem*, *op. cit.* (Mecca, al-Maṭba'at al-Miṣriyyah, 1311/1893), pp. 1, 126; *idem*, *op. cit.* (Cairo, Maṭba'at Dār Iḥyā' al-Kutub al-'Arabiyyah, 1342/1924), pp. 1, 121-2; Abdullah, *Syeikh Abdush Shamad*, p. 60.

- 33 Cf. Leiden University, Or. 6919, Or. 3284, Or. 1958, Or. 8487, Or. 1710, Or. 7231 (incomplete); National Library of Malaysia, MS 1519, MS 464, MS 315, MS 1425, MS 1324 (copied in Mecca); Islamic Arts Museum of Malaysia, MI 90, MI 277, MI 334, MI 417.
- 34 See al-Falimbānī, *Hidāyat as-Sālikīn* (MSS National Library of Malaysia), MS 464; idem, *op. cit.* (MS Leiden University), Or. 1958, p. 290.
- 35 Cf. al-Falimbānī, *Hidāyat as-Sālikīn* (1st edition, Egypt, [al-Maṭba'at al-Miṣriyyah], 1298/1881), p. 339; idem, *op. cit.* (Bombay, al-Maṭba'at al-Ḥasaniyyah, 1311/1893), p. 347.
- 36 These numbers represent the 'Abjadī' numerical values of the Arabic letters in the previous line of this poem and when added up indicate the corresponding year of publication (1298 A.D.).
- 37 Cf. al-Bantānī, *Marāqī al-'Ubūdiyyah*, p. 99; al-Falimbānī, *Hidāyat as-Sālikīn*, p. 123.
- 38 Al-Falimbānī says: "*lammā kānat sanat alf wa-mi'ah wa-thalātha wa-tis'īn ... alham Allāh Ta'ālā fī qalbī an utarjīm kitāb imām al-fuqahā' al-'ālimīn wa-qudwat aṣ-ṣūfiyyah al-muḥaqqiqīn al-muṣṣamā bi-Lubāb Iḥyā' 'Ulūm ad-Dīn al-jāmi' bayn ash-sharī'ah wa 'l-ṭarīqah wa 'l-mutaḍammīn fihī 'ilm uṣūl ad-dīn wa 'l-fiqh wa 'l-taṣawwuf an-nāfi'ah bi-kalām al-jāwī ma'a ziyādat fawā'id nafīṣah li-yantafī bihi man lā ma'rīfat lahu bi-kalām al-'Arab*," see al-Falimbānī, *Sayr as-Sālikīn*, vol. 1, pp. 2-3.
- 39 Cf. al-Falimbānī, *Sayr as-Sālikīn*, vol. 1, pp. 7, 9, 11, 14, 21, *passim*.
- 40 See Ritter, H., *EF*, vol. II, p. 1041. Cf. al-Baghdādī, *Hadiyyat al-'Arīfīn*, vol. 1, p. 83; Ḥājī Khalīfah (d. 1067/1657), *Muṣṭafā b. 'Abd Allāh, Kashf az-Zunūn 'an Asāmī al-Kutub wa 'l-Funūn* (2 vols., Beirut, Dār Iḥyā' at-Turāth al-'Arabī, s.a.), vol. 1, p. 24.
- 41 Cf. Brockelmann, *GAL (S)*, vol. I, p. 748.
- 42 Al-Ghazālī, *Mukhtaṣar Iḥyā' 'Ulūm ad-Dīn*, in the margin of al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī, Taqī ad-Dīn 'Abd al-Malik b. Abī al-Munā ash-shahīr bi 'sh-Shaykh 'Ubayd ad-Dārīr, *Nuzhat an-Nāzīrīn fī Tafsīr Āyāt min Kitāb Rabb al-'Ālamīn wa-Aḥādīth Marwiyyah 'an Sayyid al-Mursalīn wa-Āthār Manqūlah 'an 'ṣ-Ṣaḥābat al-Muntakhabīn wa-Hikāyāt Ma'ṭhūrah 'an 'l-Anbiyā' wa 'l-Ulamā' wa 'ṣ-Sāliḥīn* (Egypt, Dār al-Kutub al-'Arabiyyah al-Kubrā, 1328/1910). Recently, I have located two later editions of the *Mukhtaṣar*, the first, published by Mua'assasat al-Kutub ath-Thaqāfiyyah, Beirut, 1st edition, 1410/1990 and the second, by Dār al-Fikr, Beirut, 1st edition, 1414/1993, respectively.
- 43 See al-Ghazālī, *Mukhtaṣar Iḥyā' 'Ulūm ad-Dīn* (1st edition, Beirut, Dār al-Fikr, 1414/1993), p. 17.

- 44 See al-Falimbānī, *Sayr as-Sālikīn*, vol. 3, pp. 176-83.
- 45 For a complete list of these works see appendix 3.
- 46 *Ibid.*
- 47 This concern for conformity of *ṭarīqah* with *sharī'ah* has become highly important, especially since al-Ghazālī's time and is reflected in much *Ṣūfī* works of the eighteenth century.
- 48 See al-Falimbānī, *Sayr as-Sālikīn*, vol. 3, p. 181.
- 49 *Ibid.*
- 50 *Ibid.*
- 51 *Ibid.*, p. 183.
- 52 The title is misspelled in al-Falimbānī's text as *as-Sirr al-Maṣūn*. Cf. al-Falimbānī, *Sayr as-Sālikīn*, vol. 3, p. 182; al-Ghazālī, *al-Maḍnūn bihi 'alā Ghayr Ahlih* (1st edition, Damascus, al-Ḥikmah, 1996/1417).
- 53 This work has been translated into English by David Buchman under the title of *The Niche of Lights*. See Buchman, David, *Al-Ghazālī: The Niche of Lights* (Utah, Brigham Young University Press, 1998).
- 54 Wrongly scribed as *al-Maqṣad al-Aqṣā ...*, see al-Falimbānī, *Sayr as-Sālikīn*, vol. 3, p. 182. This work has been translated into English by Burrell, David B., and Daher, Nazih, *Al-Ghazālī: The Ninety-Nine Beautiful Names of God. al-Maqṣad al-asnā fī sharḥ asmā' Allāh al-ḥusnā* (Cambridge, The Islamic Texts Society, 1995).
- 55 Wrongly scribed as *Taḥiyyat al-Mas'alah ...*, see *ibid.*, p. 183. Cf. an-Nābulusī (d. 1143/1731), 'Abd al-Ghanī b. Ismā'īl, *Nukhbat al-Mas'alah Sharḥ at-Tuḥfat al-Mursalah ilā 'n-Nabī* (MS Princeton University), MS 1113.
- 56 See al-Falimbānī, *Sayr as-Sālikīn*, vol. 3, pp. 182-3.
- 57 *Ibid.*, p. 180.
- 58 *Ibid.*
- 59 *Ibid.*, p. 183.
- 60 See Haron, Abdul Fatah, "Kitab Siyar al-Salikin oleh Abdul Samad al-Falimbani Mengelirukan" in *Islam: Past, Present and Future*, edited by Ahmad Sunawari Long, Jaffary Awang and Kamaruddin Salleh (Bangi, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 2004), pp. 1072-80.
- 61 See Bruinessen, Martin van, "Kitab Kuning: Books in Arabic Script used in the Pesantren Milieu," *BKI*, 146 (1990) pp. 257-8.
- 62 See al-Falimbānī, *Sayr as-Sālikīn*, vol. 3, pp. 7-12.
- 63 See al-Falimbānī, *Sayr as-Sālikīn*, vol. 4, pp. 102-6.
- 64 Cf. al-Khānī (d. 1109/1697), Qāsim b. Ṣalāḥ ad-Dīn al-Ḥalabī, *as-Sayr wa 's-Sulūk ilā Malik al-Mulūk*, edited by Sa'īd 'Abd al-Fattāḥ (1st edition,

- Cairo, Maktabat ath-Thaqāfat ad-Dīniyyah, 1422/2002), pp. 37-8, 127-206; al-Ghazālī, *Mukhtaṣar Ihya'*, p. 131; idem, *Ihya' 'Ulūm ad-Dīn* (1st edition, 4 vols., Beirut, Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1423/2002), vol. 3, p. 6.
- ⁶⁵ Cf. al-Falimbānī, *Sayr as-Sālikīn*, vol. 4, pp. 103, 104, 105.
- ⁶⁶ See al-Ghazālī, *Mukhtaṣar Ihya'*, pp. 223-31; idem, *Ihya'*, vol. 4, pp. 328-46.
- ⁶⁷ See Haron, Abdul Fatah, "Wahdat al-Wujud – Martabat Tujuh dalam Khazanah Kitab Lama dan Baru," paper presented in Seminar Bahan Rujukan Islam Nusantara, Brunei, 20-23 August 2001, pp. 25-6.
- ⁶⁸ See al-Minkābāwī (d. 1334/1916), Aḥmad Khaṭīb b. 'Abd al-Laṭīf al-Jāwī, *ash-Shumūs al-Lāmi'ah fī Radd Bida' Ahl 'l-Marātib as-Sab'ah* (Mecca, Maṭba'at al-Mirīyyah, 1331/1913), pp. 2-3.
- ⁶⁹ *Ibid*, p. 3.
- ⁷⁰ *Ibid*.
- ⁷¹ See al-Ghazālī, *Deliverance from Error*, translated by W. Montgomery Watt (Kuala Lumpur, Islamic Book Trust, 2005), p. 46.
- ⁷² *Ibid*, pp. 46-7.
- ⁷³ *Ibid*, pp. 47-8.
- ⁷⁴ See al-Ghazālī, *Ihya'*, vol. 1, pp. 490-5.
- ⁷⁵ See al-Faṭānī (d. 1263/1846), Dāwūd b. 'Abd Allāh b. Idrīs, *Minhāj al-'Ābidīn ilā Jannat Rabb al-'Ālamīn* (Pulau Pinang, Percetakan Almuarif Sdn. Bhd., s.a.), pp. 4, 146-7.
- ⁷⁶ See el-Muhammady, "The Islamic concept of education," pp. 62-3.
- ⁷⁷ I was able to consult both editions in the Leiden University Library in 2006.
- ⁷⁸ See Drewes, *Directions for travellers*, p. 223.
- ⁷⁹ See al-Falimbānī, *Sayr as-Sālikīn* (MS National Library of Malaysia), MS 692.
- ⁸⁰ See al-Falimbānī, *Hidāyat as-Sālikīn*, p. 27; idem, *Sayr as-Sālikīn*, vol. 3, p. 180; vol. 4, p. 259.
- ⁸¹ See al-Falimbānī, *al-'Urwat al-Wuthqā*, MSS 2865, fol. 1; MSS 2269, fol. 19.
- ⁸² See al-Falimbānī, *al-'Urwat al-Wuthqā*, MSS 2086, pp. 1, 2.
- ⁸³ *Op. cit.*, MSS 2269, fols. 21, 22, 23, 26, 34, 36, 51.
- ⁸⁴ *Ibid*, MSS 2269, fol. 23; MSS 2865, fol. 6.
- ⁸⁵ Cf. al-Falimbānī, *al-'Urwat al-Wuthqā*, MSS 2865, fols. 1-3; MSS 2269, fols. 19-20; idem, *Sayr as-Sālikīn*, vol. 3, pp. 39-40; al-Jabartī, *Tārīkh 'Ajā'ib al-Āthār*, vol. 1, p. 243; Quds, *al-Futūḥāt al-Qudsiyyah*, pp. 6-7.

Al-Jabartī himself missed three names in his work. For a good study on all the intermediaries in this *silsilah*, see Qarīb Allāh, *as-Salāsīl adh-Dhahabiyyah*, especially pp. 45-80, 96-100.

86 For further discussion of this criticism, see al-Fādānī, *an-Nafḥat al-Miskiyyah*, p. 112.

87 See al-Falimbānī, *Sayr as-Sālikīn*, vol. 4, p. 259.

88 *Ibid.*

89 See Chapter 2, pp. 48-49.

90 See *Rātib*, MSS 2367, fols. 13, 24, 27, 29, 34, 37, 43.

91 *Supra*, Chapter 1, pp. 6-7; Chapter 2, pp. 49-50.

92 See Drewes, "Further data," pp. 270, 290, 291.

93 *Ibid.*, pp. 273-4.

94 For further discussion see Hurgonje (1857-1936), Christiaan Snouck, *Achehnese*, trans. O'Sullivan, A.W.S., (2 vols., Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1906), vol. II, p. 119.

95 It is important to observe that such discontent was already reflected in the works of al-Falimbānī's predecessors such as Muḥammad Zayn b. Faqīh Jalāl ad-Dīn al-Ashī's *Bidāyat al-Hidāyah* where he clearly refers the Dutch or in his own terms, *Hūlandah* (Holland) as *balā'* (affliction) and *fiṭnah* (ordeal) to the Archipelago. See his *Bidāyat al-Hidāyah*, p. 31.

96 Evidently, the only scholar who consulted the Jakarta manuscript copies was Ronkel, as he correctly gives the brief Arabic titles of all the seven chapters included in this work in his catalogue. See Ronkel, Ph. S. van, *Supplement to the catalogue of the Arabic manuscripts preserved in the Museum of The Batavia Society of Arts and Sciences* (The Hague, Nijhoff, 1913), pp. 139-40.

97 For further details, see bibliography.

98 The complete table of contents of this text is as follow: first chapter (fol. 1a): *fī faḍl al-jihād fī sabīl Allāh wa 'l-ḥath 'alayhi*; second chapter (fol. 3b): *fī bayān al-aḥādīth al-wāridah fī faḍl al-jihād*; third chapter (fol. 5a): *fī bayān faḍl ar-ribā' fī sabīl Allāh wa 'l-ḥaras fīhi*; fourth chapter (fol. 6b): *fī bayān al-aḥādīth al-wāridah fī faḍl al-infāq fī sabīl Allāh wa-tajhīz al-ghuzzāt fīhi*; fifth chapter (fol. 7b): *fī faḍl al-isti'dād [bi-]ālat al-jihād fī sabīl Allāh wa 'l-ḥath 'alā 'r-ramī wa-ta'allumihī*; sixth chapter (fol. 9a): *fī bayān faḍl ash-shahādat fī sabīl Allāh*; seventh chapter (fol. 13a): *fī bayān aḥkām al-jihād fī sabīl Allāh*; *khātimah* (epilogue) (fol. 15a): *fī dhikr du'ā' ihī SAW ... fī 'l-jihād fī sabīl Allāh*; and *mulḥaq* (addendum) (fol. 16b): *fī dhikr ḥirz nāfi' wa-ḥirs māni' wa-ḥiṣn dāfi'*.

- 99 See al-Falimbānī, *Naṣīḥat al-Muslimīn wa-Tadhkirat al-Mu'minīn fī Faḍā'il al-Jihād fī Sabīl Allāh wa-Karāmat al-Mujāhidīn fī Sabīl Allāh* (MS Leiden University), F. Or. A20C, fols. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.
- 100 *Ibid.*, fol. 5.
- 101 Al-Falimbānī says "inna al-aḥādīth al-latī awradnāhā fī ḥādhiḥ an-naṣīḥah muqtabasa min al-Jāmi' aṣ-Ṣaghīr li 'l-'Alāfiṣ as-Suyūṭī, wa-min Kashf al-Ghumma li 'l-'Ārif bi-Allāh ash-Shaykh 'Abd al-Wahhāb ash-Sha'rānī, wa-aktharuhā min 'r-risālah al-musammā bi-Maslak ar-Rashād ilā 'l-Aḥādīth al-Wāridah fī Faḍl al-Jihād li 'l-'Ārif bi-Allāh shaykh mashāyikhinā Munlā Ibrāhīm b. Ḥasan al-Kurdī al-Kūrānī." See al-Falimbānī, *Naṣīḥat al-Muslimīn*, fol. 16b. However, Kaḥḥālāh was the only biographer who ascribes the *Maslak* to al-Kūrānī, entitled *Maslak al-Irshād ilā 'l-Aḥādīth al-Wāridah fī 'l-Jihād*. See his *Mu'jam al-Mu'allifīn*, vol. 1, p. 21.
- 102 See al-Faḡānī (d. 1263/1846), Dāwūd b. 'Abd Allāh b. Idrīs al-Jāwī, *Sullam al-Mubtadī fī Ma'rifat Tarīqat al-Muhtadī* (Pulau Pinang, Percetakan Almuarif Sdn. Bhd., s.a.), pp. 34-5. He also includes a summary of the above text in his later work, *Furū' al-Masā'il*, which he began writing in 1254/1838 and was completed in Mecca in 1257/1841, see idem, *Furū' al-Masā'il wa-Uṣūl al-Wasā'il* (2 vols., Bangkok, Maktabat wa-Maṭba'at Muḥammad an-Nahdī wa-Awlādihi, s.a.), vol. 2, p. 335.
- 103 Supra, pp. 10, 39, 92, 110, 220, 235.
- 104 See Quzwain, *Mengenal Allāh*, p. 29. Cf. Azra, *The Origin of Islamic Reformism*, p. 200.
- 105 See al-Falimbānī, *Zād al-Muttaqīn*, MSFB 1004, fol. 1a. This text is written in Arabic with interlinear translation in *Jāwī*. I have edited the text together with my own English translation and is under preparation and will hopefully be published in the near future.
- 106 See al-Falimbānī, *Sayr as-Sālikīn*, vol. 3, pp. 22, 183.
- 107 *Ibid.*, p. 183.
- 108 *Ibid.*
- 109 *Ibid.* For a good concise discussion on the *Sūfī* doctrine of *waḥdat al-wujūd* see Akkach, 'Abd al-Ghani al-Nabulsi, pp. 88-94.
- 110 See al-Batāwī (d. 1331/1913), 'Uthmān b. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Aqīl b. Yaḥyā al-'Alawī, *Ṣawn ad-Dīn 'an Nazagāt al-Muḍillīn* (Batavia, s.n., 1321/1903), p. 24.
- 111 See Quds, *al-Futūḥāt al-Qudsiyyah*, p. 19.
- 112 See al-Falimbānī, *Zād al-Muttaqīn*, MSFB 1004, fols. 5a, 5b.

- 113 See al-Falimbānī, 'Abd aṣ-Ṣamad, *Risālah fī Bayān Asbāb Muḥarramāt an-Nikāḥ* (MSS National Library of Malaysia), MSS 2824, fol. 4. However, the date from a second copy of the same text, MSS 2783, was omitted by its scribe.
- 114 See al-Falimbānī, *Sayr as-Sālikīn*, vol. 2, pp. 39-40.
- 115 See al-Falimbānī, *Risālah Laṭīfah fī Bayān al-Isrā' wa 'l-M'irāj* (MSS National Library of Malaysia), MSS 1079, fol. 20; MSS 2968, fol. 24; (MS Leiden University), Or. 17.903, p. 317. 11 Rajab/3 December of that year falls on Thursday, and it is to be remembered that under the traditional Islamic notion the day begins at sunset, this Friday night is the equivalent of the eve of Friday.
- 116 See bibliography for further details.
- 117 See al-Falimbānī, *Risālah Laṭīfah*, MSS 1079, fol. 13; MSS 2968, fols. 14, 15; Or. 17.903, pp. 282, 285.
- 118 *Ibid*, Or. 17.903, p. 317; MSS 1079, fol. 20; MSS 2968, fol. 24.
- 119 See Hurgonje, *Mekka in the Later Part of 19th Century*, p. 210.
- 120 See al-Faṭānī (d. 1263/1846), Dāwūd b. 'Abd Allāh al-Jāwī, *Kifāyat al-Muḥtāj fī 'l-Isrā' wa 'l-Mi'rāj*, (Bombay, s.n., 1298/1881), p. 68. Cf. Abdullah, *Syeikh Abdus Shamad*, p. 145.
- 121 See al-Falimbānī, *Mulḥaq fī Bayān al-Fawā'id an-Nāfi'ah fī 'l-Jihād fī Sabīl Allāh* (MSS National Library of Malaysia), MSS 2269 (D), fols. 76-80. The exact copy is also printed lithographically in Abdullah, *Al-'Urwatul Wutsqa*, pp. 120-9. Cf. Abdullah, "Peranan Ulama' dalam Silat," pp. 13-6.
- 122 The four *fawā'id* are as follow: the first, *fī dhikr ḥirz nāfi' wa-ḥirz māni' wa-ḥirz dāfi'*, the second, *ad-du'ā' an-nāfi' fī 'l-jihād*, the third, *min-mā yanfa' li-halāk al-'aduww wa 's-salāmat min su'ih*, and the fourth and last, *min-mā yanfa' li-halāk al-'aduww wa 'l-kuffār wa li-salāmat min sharrihim*.
- 123 See al-Falimbānī, 'Abd aṣ-Ṣamad al-Jāwī, *Risālah fī Bayān Ḥukm ash-Shar' wa-Bayān Man Yukhālifuḥu fī 'l-'Iṭiqād aw fī 'l-Ḥukm aw fī 'l-'Amal* (MSS National Library of Malaysia), MSS 2308, fol. 36.
- 124 I have only been able to consult one copy of this work from which I have primarily based my reading and research. The second copy, which was not accessible, is held by the National Museum of Terengganu, Malaysia, D24 (D), fols. 27v.-38v. See Omar, Siti Mariani, *Katalog Induk Manuskrip Melayu di Malaysia* (Kuala Lumpur, Perpustakaan Negara Malaysia, 1993), p. 21.

- 125 See al-Fādānī, *al-Wāfī*, pp. 5, 77; idem, *al-'Iqd al-Farīd*, p. 38.
- 126 See al-Falimbānī, *Risālah fī Bayān Ḥukm ash-Shar'*, MSS 2308, fols. 29-30.
- 127 *Ibid*, fols. 30, 31, 32,
- 128 See al-Falimbānī, 'Abd aṣ-Ṣamad al-Jāwī, *Risālah fī Kayfiyyat Rātib Laylat al-Jum'ah ba'd Ṣalāt al-'Ishā'* (MSS National Library of Malaysia), MS 2269 (C), fols. 58-70; idem, *Kayfiyyat Khatm Yawm ar-Rabū' fī Waqt al-'Aṣr* (MSS National Library of Malaysia, MS 2269 (C), fols. 70b-75. Both copies are printed lithographically in Abdullah, *Al-'Urwat al-Wutsqa*, pp. 140-65 and pp. 130-40 respectively.
- 129 See al-Falimbānī, 'Abd aṣ-Ṣamad al-Jāwī, *Du'ā' al-Musabba'āt al-'Ashar* (MSS National Library of Malaysia), MSS 2507 (B); (MSS Leiden University), Or. 8487 fols. 184-6.
- 130 See al-Kattānī, *Fahras al-Fahāris*, vol. 1, p. 145; vol. 2, p. 1162; Ibn 'Ābidīn, *'Uqūd al-La'ālī*, pp. 158-9; al-Amīr al-Kabīr, *Ṭabat Muḥammad al-Amīr al-Kabīr*, p. 37.
- 131 See ash-Sharqāwī, *al-Jāmi' al-Ḥāwī*, p. 41.
- 132 See al-Falimbānī, *Du'ā'*, MSS 2507 (B); Or. 8487 fol. 184; idem, *al-'Urwat al-Wuthqā*, MSS 2865, fol. 7; MSS 2269, fol. 25; idem, *Sayr as-Sālikīn*, vol. 1, p. 219.
- 133 Cf. ash-Sharqāwī, *al-Jāmi' al-Ḥāwī*, p. 41; al-Ghazālī, *Iḥyā'*, vol. 1, pp. 473-4; Qarīb Allāh, *as-Salāsīl adh-Dhahabiyyah*, pp. 151-2.
- 134 See Ikram, Achadiati (ed.), *Katalog Naskah Palembang: Catalogue of Palembang Manuscripts* (Tokyo, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, 2004), pp. 49-50.
- 135 See al-Falimbānī, *Du'ā'*, MSS 2507 (B), p. 44.
- 136 See al-Falimbānī, *Sayr as-Sālikīn*, vol. 1, pp. 218-20; idem, *al-'Urwat al-Wuthqā*, MSS 2865, fols. 7-8; MSS 2269, fol. 25-6. Cf. Quds, *al-Futūḥāt al-Qudsiyyah*, pp. 8-9; al-Falimbānī, Azharī, *Badī' az-Zamān*, p. 126; al-Būghūrī (d. 1349/1930), Muḥammad Mukhtār b. 'Aṭārīd al-Jāwī al-Makkī, *ad-Durr al-Munīf fī Sharḥ al-Wird al-Laṭīf* (Singapore, Maṭba'at Muḥammad Amīn, 1317/1899), pp. 40-44; al-Ḥabshī, *'Iqd al-Yawāqūt al-Jawhariyyah*, vol. 1, p. 89.
- 137 See Mamdūḥ, *I'lām al-Qāṣī*, p. 70; al-Falimbānī, Mukhtār, *Bulūgh al-Amānī*, vol. 1, p. 165.
- 138 See al-Ahdal, *an-Nafas al-Yamānī*, p. 139.
- 139 Among *ṭabats* published by those connected to al-Falimbānī, in chronological order, include Aḥmad al-Qushāshī's (d. 1071/1661) *as-Simṭ al-Majīd fī Sha'n al-Bay'ah wa 'dh-Dhikr wa-Talqīnihi wa-Salāsīl*

Ahl 'l-Tawhīd; 'Īsā ath-Tha'ālabī's (d. 1080/1669) *Thabat Shams ad-Dīn al-Bābilī, al-musammā: Muntakhab al-Asānīd fī Waṣli 'l-Muṣannaḥāt wa 'l-Ajzā' wa 'l-Masānīd*; Abū Sālim al-'Ayyāshī's (d. 1090/1679) *Ithāf al-Akhillā' bi-Ijāzāt al-Mashāyikh al-Ajillā'*; Muḥammad ar-Rūdānī's (d. 1094/1682) *Ṣilat al-Khalaf bi-Mawṣūl as-Salaf*; Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī's (d. 1101/1690) *al-Umam li-Iqāz al-Himam*; Aḥmad an-Nakhlī's (d. 1130/1717) *Bughyat at-Ṭalībīn li-Bayān al-Mashāyikh al-Muḥaqqiqīn al-Mu'tamidīn*; 'Abd Allāh al-Baṣrī's (d. 1134/1722) *al-Imdād bi-Ma'rifat 'Uluw 'l-Isnād*; Muḥammad al-Budayrī known as Ibn al-Mayyit's (d. 1140/1727) *al-Jawāhir al-Ghawālī fī Bayān al-Asānīd al-'Awālī*; Ibn 'Aqīlah's (d. 1150/1737) *al-Fawā'id al-Jalīlah fī Musalsalāt Ibn 'Aqīlah*; Muḥammad Sa'īd Sunbul's (d. 1175/1761) *al-Awā'il as-Sunbuliyyah*; Muḥammad al-Ḥifnī's (d. 1181/1767) *Thabat*; Aḥmad al-Mullawī's (d. 1182/1767) *Thabat*; Muḥammad as-Saffārīnī's (d. 1188/1774) *Thabat al-Imām as-Saffārīnī al-Ḥanbalī wa-Ijāzātuhi li-Ṭā'ifah min A'yān 'Ulamā' 'Aṣrihi*; Aḥmad ad-Damanhūrī's (d. 1192/1778) *al-Laṭā'if an-Nūriyyah fī 'l-Minah ad-Damanhūriyyah*; Murtaḍā az-Zabīdī's (d. 1205/1790) *Alfiyyat as-Sanad, al-Mu'jam al-Mukhtaṣṣ, Mu'jam al-'Allāmah Ṣaḥīḥ ad-Dīn Muḥammad al-Bukhārī al-Atharī, and al-Murabbī al-Kābulī fī-Man Rawā 'an 'sh-Shams al-Bābilī*; Aḥmad al-Aṭṭār's (d. 1218/1803) *Thabat al-'Aṭṭār*; 'Abd Allāh ash-Sharqāwī's (d. 1227/1812) *al-Jāmi' al-Ḥawī fī Marwiyyāt ash-Sharqāwī*; Muḥammad al-Amīr al-Kabīr's (d. 1232/1816) *Thabat Muḥammad al-Amīr al-Kabīr*; Muḥammad ash-Shanawānī's (d. 1233/1817) *ad-Durar as-Saniyyah fī-mā 'Alā min 'l-Asānīd ash-Shanawāniyyah*; 'Abd al-'Azīz ad-Dihlawī's (d. 1239/1823) *al-'Ujālah an-Nāfi'ah*; 'Abd ar-Raḥmān al-Ahdal's (d. 1250/1834) *an-Nafas al-Yamānī wa 'r-Rawḥ ar-Rayḥānī fī Ijāzat al-Qudāt Banī ash-Shawkānī, and Barakat ad-Dunyī wa 'l-Ukhrā fī 'l-Ijāzat al-Kubrā*; Muḥammad ash-Shawkānī's (d. 1250/1834) *Ithāf al-Akābir bi-Asānīd ad-Dafātīr*; Ibn 'Ābidīn's (d. 1252/1836) *Uqūd al-La'ālī fī 'l-Asānīd al-'Awālī*; Muḥammad 'Ābid as-Sindī's (d. 1257/1841) *Ḥaṣr ash-Shāriḥ min Asānīd Muḥammad 'Ābid*; 'Abd ar-Raḥmān al-Kuzbarī's (d. 1262/1846) *Thabat al-Kuzbarī, and Intikhāb al-'Awālī wa 'sh-Shuyūkh al-Akhyār min Fahāris Shaykhinā al-Imām al-Musnid al-'Aṭṭār*; Ḥasan ash-Shaṭṭī's (d. 1274/1857) *Thabat al-'Allāmah al-Faqīh al-Muḥaddith ash-Shaykh Ḥasan b. 'Umar ash-Shaṭṭī al-Ḥanbalī ad-Dimashqī*; Maḥmūd al-Ḥamzāwī's (d. 1305/1887) *Unwān al-Asānīd*; 'Aydūs al-Ḥabshī's (d. 1314/1896) *Iqd al-Yawāqūt al-Jawhariyyah wa-Simṭ al-'Ayn adh-Dhahabiyyah bi-Dhikr Ṭarīq as-Sādāt al-'Alawiyyah, and 'Uqūd al-La'āl fī Asānīd ar-*

Rijāl; Fālih az-Zāhirī's (d. 1328/1910) *Husnu 'l-Wafā li-Ikhwān as-Ṣafā*; Shams al-Iḥaq al-'Aẓīm Ābādī's (d. 1329/1911) *al-Wijāzah fī 'l-Ijāzah*; 'Uthmān al-Batāwī's (d. 1331/1913) *as-Silsilat an-Nabawiyyah fī Asānīd as-Sādat al-'Alawiyyah ilā Jaddihim al-Muṣṭafā Khayr al-Bariyyah*; 'Abd al-Ḥamīd Quds's (d. 1334/1915) *al-Mafākhir as-Saniyyah fī 'l-Asānīd al-'Aliyyah al-Qudsiyyah*; Muḥammad Amīn as-Safarjalānī's (d. 1335/1916) *'Uqūd al-Asānīd*; Muḥammad A'ẓam al-Khayr Ābādī's (d. 1337/1918) *al-Isnād al-A'ẓam bi-A'lā Sanad Yūjad fī 'l-'Ālam*; Muḥammad Maḥfūẓ at-Tarmasī's (d. 1338/1920) *Kifāyat al-Mustafīd li-mā 'Alā ladā 't-Tarmasī min 'l-Asānīd*, and *Mu'jam Shuyūkh al-Ḥāfiẓ Muḥammad Maḥfūẓ b. 'Abd Allāh at-Tarmasī*; Khawqir's (d. 1349/1930) *Thabat al-Athbāt ash-Shahīrah*; Mukhtār al-Būghūrī's (d. 1349/1930) *Ithāf as-Sādat al-Muḥaddithīn bi-Musalsalāt al-Aḥādīth al-Arba'in*; 'Umar al-Maḥrasī's (d. 1368/1949) *Ithāf Dhawī 'l-'Irfān bi-Ba'd Asānīd 'Umar Ḥamdān*; 'Abd al-Ḥayy al-Kattānī's (d. 1382/1962) *Fahras al-Fahāris wa 'l-Athbāt wa-Mu'jam al-Ma'ājim wa 'l-Mashīkhāt wa 'l-Musalsalāt*; 'Alawī al-Ḥaddād's (d. 1382/1962) *al-Khulāṣat al-Wāfiyah fī 'l-Asānīd al-'Āliyah*; 'Alawī al-Mālikī's (d. 1391/1971) *Fihrist ash-Shuyūkh wa 'l-Asānīd*; Ḥasan al-Mashāṭ's (d. 1399/1979) *al-Irshād bi-Dhikri Ba'd mā-lī min 'l-Ijāzat wa 'l-Isnād*; Maḥmūd Sa'id Mamdūh's *Fath al-'Azīz fī Asānīd as-Sayyid 'Abd al-'Azīz*; Abū Ghuddah's (d. 1417/1996) *Imdād al-Fattāh bi-Asānīd wa-Marwiyyāt ash-Shaykh 'Abd al-Fattāh*; Muḥammad b. 'Alawī al-Mālikī's (d. 1425/2004) *al-'Uqūd al-Lu'lu'iyah bi 'l-Asānīd al-'Alawiyyah*; Muḥammad Akram an-Nadwī's *Nafahāt al-Hind wa 'l-Yaman bi-Asānīd ash-Shaykh Abī al-Ḥasan*. For further listing regarding *thabats* see Abū Ghuddah, *Imdād al-Fattāh*, pp. 410-591.

¹⁴⁰ See Chapter 1, p. 21.

¹⁴¹ Among these *Jāwī* scholars and their *thabats* we may mention 'Abd al-Ghanī al-Bīmāwī's (d. 1270/1853) *Al-Ḥāwī fī Asānīd al-Bīmāwī*; Fāṭimah al-Falimbāniyyah's *Al-Fahāris al-Qā'imah fī Asānīd Fāṭimah*; Aḥmad Khaṭīb al-Minkābāwī's (d. 1334/1916) *I'lām ar-Rāwī fī Asānīd Aḥmad al-Khaṭīb al-Minkābāwī*; Mukhtār 'Aṭārid al-Būghūrī's (d. 1349/1930) *Ithāf al-Muḥaddithīn bi-Musalsalāt al-Aḥādīth al-Arb'in*, *Manhal al-Wārid fī Shuyūkh Ibn 'Aṭārid*, and *Jam' ash-Shawārid min Marwiyyāt Ibn 'Aṭārid*; 'Umar as-Samārānī's compilation of his teacher *isnāds* entitled *Thabat al-Ḥāfiẓ ash-Shaykh Zayn ad-Dīn b. Badawī al-Jāwī*; 'Abd al-Fattāh Rāwah's (b. 1334/1915) *al-Majmū'at ar-Rāwiyah li 'l-Aḥādīth al-Musalsalah bi 's-Ṣifāt al-Marwiyyah*, and *al-Maṣā'id ar-Rāwiyah ilā 'l-Asānīd wa 'l-Kutub wa 'l-Mutūn al-Marḍiyyah*. For further list on

- thabats see Mamdūh, *ʿIlām al-Qāṣī*, pp. 63-82; idem, *Tashnīf al-Asmāʾ*, pp. 109, 410; Abū Ghuddah, *Imdād al-Fattāh*, p. 443; al-Mālikī, *Fihrist*, p. 285; al-Falimbānī, Mukhtār, *Bulūgh al-Amānī*, vol. 1, pp. 59, 63, 163.
- 142 Muḥammad Bahjat b. Bahāʾ ad-Dīn b. ʿAbd al-Ghanī b. Ḥasan al-Bayṭār is a paternal grandson of ʿAbd ar-Razzāq b. Ḥasan al-Bayṭār, author of *Ḥilyat al-Bashar*. See Kaḥḥālāh, *Muʿjam al-Muʿallifīn*, vol. 5, p. 235; al-Bayṭār, *Ḥilyat al-Bashar*, vol. 2, p. 851 footnote.
- 143 See al-Ahdal, *an-Nafas al-Yamānī*, p. 139.
- 144 See Yusof, *Kedah*, p. 14; idem, *Periwayatan*, appendix. 1-3.
- 145 See Yusof, *Kedah*, p. 14; idem, *Periwayatan*, appendix. 3.
- 146 These numbers represent the ʿAbjadī numerical values of the Arabic letters in the last line of this poem and when added up indicate the corresponding year (1246 A.D.).
- 147 See Yusof, *Kedah*, p. 14; idem, *Periwayatan*, pp. 11-2.
- 148 Supra, Chapter 1, p. 15; Chapter 2, pp. 35, 37.
- 149 See Abdullah, *Syeikh Abdus Shamad*, p. 131.
- 150 A copy of this edition, undated and without the publisher's name is preserved in the University of Leiden Library. Cf. Ibn al-Faqīh, ʿAbd aṣ-Ṣamad b. Faqīh Ḥusayn, *Anīs al-Muttaqīn*, pp. 1, 3.
- 151 See Voorhoeve, *Handlist of Arabic manuscripts in the Library of the University of Leiden and other collections in The Netherlands* (The Hague, Leiden University Press, 1980), p. 14; idem, ʿAbd al-Ṣamad b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Palimbānī, *EP*, vol. 1, p. 92.
- 152 See Ibn al-Faqīh, *Anīs al-Muttaqīn* (MSS Leiden University), Or. 1751, fols. 313-22; Or. 7030, pp. 218-43; Or. 7049, fols. 65-97.
- 153 See Kaḥḥālāh, *Muʿjam al-Muʿallifīn*, vol. 5, p. 236; al-Baghdādī, *ʿIdāh al-Maknūn*, vol. 1, p. 149; Muṭīʾ ar-Raḥmān, *al-Fahras al-Mukhtaṣar*, vol. 3, p. 1152.
- 154 Cf. Kaḥḥālāh, *Muʿjam al-Muʿallifīn*, vol. 5, pp. 235, 236.
- 155 See al-Ashī, ʿAbd ar-Raḥīm al-Jāwī, *Hidāyat al-Muttaqīn* (MSS National Library of Malaysia), MSS 2261(B); MSS 2086; MSS 2466(E).
- 156 The rest of the evidence which he includes were: The Leningrad manuscript copy (photos 15-99) bears the entry Van Doorninck, 1876, who according to Voorhoeve was stationed in Palembang as a civil servant from 1873-1875 and then went to Europe on furlough; there is a marginal note in Javanese (photo 23); the word *sanggar* in the Middle Malay is used to indicate a heathen offering, but not in the Javanese meaning and Voorhoeve assumes that the censured heathen practices probably occurred in the Palembang hinterland about 1774; and finally, the Jakarta manuscript

copy (MS. VdW. 37) contains a page dedicated to *jihād*, which according to Voorhoeve was one of 'Abd aṣ-Ṣamad's specialities. The Leningrad manuscript copy is preserved in the University of Leiden Library, Or. 14.359. See Drewes, "Further data," pp. 273-4; idem, *Directions for Travellers*, p. 223; Quzwain, *Mengenal Allah*, pp. 20-2. For the summary of *Tuḥfat ar-Rāghibīn*, see Drewes, "Further data," pp. 277-90.

¹⁵⁷ However, it is a haste to conclude that the *Tuḥfat* was written at the request of the Sulṭān of Palembang just because al-Falimbānī wrote two letters to the Princes of Java; it would have been more plausible if Drewes suggests that it was written at the request of the ruler of Java. See Drewes, "Further data," pp. 267, 273-90.

¹⁵⁸ See Quzwain, *Mengenal Allah*, pp. 20-3; Azra, *The Origin of Islamic Reformism*, pp. 134-5, 200.

¹⁵⁹ See Azra, "A Hadhrami Religious Scholar in Indonesia: Sayyid 'Uthmān" in Freitag, Ulrike and Clarence-Smith, William G. (eds.) *Hadhrami Traders, Scholars and Statesmen in the Indian Ocean, 1750s-1960s* (Leiden; New York, Brill, 1997), p. 257.

¹⁶⁰ Cf. al-Banjārī, Ṣiddīq *Risālah Shajarah al-Arshadiyah*, p. 9; Azra, "A Hadhrami Religious Scholar," p. 257.

¹⁶¹ See al-Faṭānī, Dāwūd b. 'Abd Allāh, *Tuḥfat ar-Rāghibīn fī Sulūk Ṭarīqat al-Muttaqīn* (MSS National Library of Malaysia), MSS 728, pp. 60, 61, 64; (MSS Islamic Arts Museum of Malaysia), MI 318, p. 55. A lithographed page of al-Faṭānī's *Tuḥfat ar-Rāghibīn* containing this information is also printed in Abdullah, *Syeikh Daud*, p. 45.

¹⁶² Ṣiddīq also points out that Arshad al-Banjārī mentioned Sulṭān Taḥmīd Allāh in the prologue of his *Sabīl al-Muhtadīn*. The latter text was begun in 1193/1779 and was completed on 27 Rabī' al-Awwal 1195/22 April 1781; with Arshad clearly stating that it was written on the behest of Sulṭān Taḥmīd Allāh. However, looking at the date the latter ascended the throne in 1778 and the completion of the *Tuḥfat* in 1188/1774, it is clear that the request was made before he assumed the crown. This is probably the most plausible reason why al-Banjārī apart from leaving his *Tuḥfat* anonymous also did not name the 'esteemed figure' (*ṭalaba minnī man lā yumkinunī mukhālafatahu ba'd akābir az-zamān*) who requested him to write the *Tuḥfat*. Cf. al-Banjārī, Ṣiddīq *Risālah Shajarah al-Arshadiyah*, p. 100; al-Banjārī, *Tuḥfat ar-Rāghibīn*, p. 2; idem, *Sabīl al-Muhtadīn*, p. 2.

¹⁶³ These include: firstly, the title page of the second edition published by Maṭba'at al-Aḥmadiyyah in Singapore in 1347/1928, which clearly

indicates that the *Tuḥfat ar-Rāghibīn* was authored by Muḥammad Arshad al-Banjārī (*hādḥā al-kitāb al-mussamā Tuḥfat ar-Rāghibīn fī Bayān Ḥaqīqat al-Mu'minīn ... ta'līf al-'Ālim al-'Allāmah Muḥammad Arshad al-Banjārī*). The publisher supports this attribution adding that this edition was corrected by the author's grandson, Ṣiddīq al-Banjārī, who himself referred to a written copy in the author's own handwriting (*telah ditashihkan risalah oleh seorang daripada zuriat muallifnya yaitu 'Abd ar-Raḥmān Ṣiddīq b. Muḥammad 'Afīf mengikut bagi khat muallifnya sendiri*). The cover page of this edition is printed lithographically in Abdullah, *Sheikh Abdus Shamad*, p. 174. Secondly, examining further the *Tuḥfat ar-Rāghibīn* and *Sabīl al-Muhtadīn*, it is evident they were written by the same author as he writes the exact same Malay text in his prologue, "Dengan nama Allāh yang amat menugraha'i nikmat besar-besar lagi yang amat menugraha'i nikmat yang sani-sani jua aku memulai ..."; the only difference between these two works is that in the latter, the name of the author and the person who requested this work are both mentioned, contrary to the former, both names are anonymous, cf. al-Banjārī, *Tuḥfat ar-Rāghibīn*, p. 2; idem, *Sabīl al-Muhtadīn*, p. 2. Thirdly, none of al-Falimbānī's known works discussed in this chapter were ever written upon the request of 'ba'd akābir az-zamān,' let alone a Sulṭān. On the contrary, evidently Arshad al-Banjārī wrote his *Sabīl al-Muhtadīn* on the behest of Sulṭān Taḥmīd Allāh. It is important to remark that unlike al-Falimbānī, al-Banjārī settled down in Banjar upon his return to the Archipelago in 1186/1772, subsequently being appointed as the *muftī* of Banjar. Thus, it is highly plausible that within two years of his return, the ruler requested him to write the *Tuḥfat*. Fourthly, contrary to the meticulous dating system of al-Falimbānī who not only tells us the year he completes his works, but also includes the day, date, month and place he finished them, the *Tuḥfat* only indicates the year of completion. Fifthly, again based on the works of al-Falimbānī, all his works written after 1187/1773 onwards never fail to mention his principal and most influential teacher as-Sammān; whereas the anonymous *Tuḥfat* written in 1188/1774, a year after *Naṣīḥat al-Muslimīn* (1187/1773) fails to mention as-Sammān even once, strongly indicating that it was not the work of al-Falimbānī. The sixth, a manuscript copy of *Tuḥfat* scribed by Muṣṭafā b. 'Abd al-Ghafūr al-Banjārī in Mecca on Wednesday, 3 Dhū al-Ḥijjah 1237/21 August 1822 indicates clearly it was the work of Muḥammad Arshad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Banjārī. This copy itself was done only one decade after the death of Arshad al-Banjārī, in addition the scribe himself was a scholar from Banjar who could have possibly

been his student, see [al-Banjārī], *Tuḥfat ar-Rāghibīn*, MSS 309, fol. 28. Seventh, the Malay word '*hubāya-hubāya*' (lit. be alert) which appears five times in the anonymous *Tuḥfat*, can only be found in the works of other Banjar scholars such as Nafīs al-Banjārī's *ad-Durr an-Nafīs* and Ṣiddīq al-Banjārī's *Syair Ibarat*. Apparently, '*hubāya-hubāya*' is only used in the local Banjar dialect as it is not utilised, to my knowledge, in other works of non-Banjar scholars, cf. al-Banjārī, *Tuḥfat ar-Rāghibīn*, pp. 5, 9, 17, 18, 28; al-Banjārī, Nafīs, *ad-Durr an-Nafīs*, pp. 6, 32; al-Banjārī (1857-1939), 'Abd ar-Raḥmān Ṣiddīq b. Muḥammad 'Alīf, *Syair Ibarat dan Khabar Kiamat*, transliteration by Suhayib Syam (1st edition, Riau, Unri Press, 2001), pp. 11, 15. Eighth, I have also been able to locate two more manuscript copies of the *Tuḥfat ar-Rāghibīn* held in private collections in South Africa: the first, in the collection of Dr. Cassiem D'arcy; although the scribe and date is unknown, this copy registered Shaykh Muḥammad Arshad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Banjārī as the author. The second copy, owned by Haji Gosain Alawie Abdelkareem, records the author at the colophon as Shaykh Muḥammad Arshad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Bajadī (obviously deviation from al-Banjārī), see Zakaria, *Katalog manuskrip Melayu di Afrika Selatan* (Kuala Lumpur, Perpustakaan Negara Malaysia, 1998), pp. 42-3, 61-2. Finally, in addition to the above, Khairil Anwar, in his Arabic article correctly includes the *Tuḥfat* among the works of al-Banjārī, pointing out that the subjective personal pronoun '*aku*' (I, me, my) used by the author of the *Tuḥfat* is identical to that used by al-Banjārī in his *Sabīl al-Muḥtadīn*. On the contrary, al-Falimbānī in all his works used the word '*hamba*,' which although carries the same meaning, is often applied in the royal courts, see Anwar, Khairil, "'Ulamā' Indūnisiyyā al-Qarni al-Thāmin 'Ashar: Tarjamah Muḥammad Arshad al-Banjārī wa-Afkāruhu" in *Studia Islamika* (3, 4, 1996), pp. 151, 161-2. Cf. Abdullah, *Syeikh Muhammad Arsyad*, pp. 103-7, for his repudiation on Voorhoeve.

¹⁶⁴ See [al-Falimbānī], *an-Nukhbat al-Mufdāh min 'r-Raḥmat al-Muḥdāh 'Alayhi 's-Salāt wa 's-Salām min Allāh* (MSS National Library of Malaysia), MSFB 1004, fols. 8-20. The exact manuscript copy is also printed lithographically in Abdullah, *Hidayatus Salikin*, vol. 2, pp. 234-58.

¹⁶⁵ See Fathurahman, Oman, "Penulis dan Penerjemah Ulama Palembang: Menghubungkan Dua Dunia," paper presented in seminar on "History of Translation in Indonesia and Malaysia," (Project of Association Archipel), Paris, April 1-5, 2002, pp. 15, 18-9.

- ¹⁶⁶ Fathurahman claims to have quoted pages 233 and 227 of Shaghir Abdullah's *Penyebaran Islam dan Silsilah Ulama Sejagat Dunia Melayu Jilid 9, Pengenalan Siri Ke-10* as his source to sight a copy of the *an-Nukhbat*. However, *Penyebaran Islam* is only published in 58 pages, and the correct work that includes a lithograph copy of this manuscript is Abdullah's *Hidayatus Salikin*, which is not included in Fathurahman's bibliography. Cf. Fathurahman, "Penulis dan Penerjemah," pp. 18, 23; Abdullah, *Penyebaran Islam*, vol. 9.
- ¹⁶⁷ See [al-Falimbānī], *an-Nukhbat al-Mufdāh*, MSFB 1004, fol. 8.
- ¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, fol. 18.
- ¹⁶⁹ See al-Banjārī, Nafīs, *ad-Durr an-Nafīs*, pp. 14, 21, 32. Cf. [al-Falimbānī], *an-Nukhbat al-Mufdāh*, MSFB 1004, fols. 9, 15, 17-8.